ORIENTALIA CHRISTIANA ANALECTA
238

ROBERT F. TAFT, S.J.
Professor at the Pontifical Oriental Institute

A HISTORY OF THE LITURGY OF ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM

Volume IV

THE DIPTYCHS

PONTIFICIUM INSTITUTUM STUDIORUM ORIENTALIUM
Piazza S. Maria Maggiore, 7
00185 ROMA
1991

ORIENTALIA CHRISTIANA ANALECTA

DE LICENTIA SUPERIORUM

Copyright Ed. Orientalia Christiana 1991

SCUOLA TIPOGRAFICA S. PIO X - VIA ETRUSCHI, 7 - ROMA

To GABRIELE WINKLER

colleague and friend of many years, who first studied these problems with me in Rome, in 1969-1970.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS AND WORKS CITED IN ABBREVIATED FORM XIII

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS XXIII

INTRODUCTION XXV
The Aim and Scope of this Study XXVI
The Genesis of this Study XXVIII
Comparative Liturgy at the Bar: A Note on Method XXIX
Sources XXXI
What's in a Name? A Word on Nomenclature XXXII

Chapter I. THE DIPTYCHS: THEIR NATURE, NAME, AND PURPOSE 1

A. DIPTYCHS, INTERCESSIONS, ACCLAMATIONS 1

B. NOMENCLATURE 7

C. PRESENT BYZANTINE LITURGICAL USAGE 9
I. The Diptychs of the Dead 9
1. The Presider's Ekphonesis 9
2. The Diaconal Diptychs 10
II. The Diptychs of the Living 11
1. The Presider's Ekphonesis 11
2. The Diaconal Diptychs 12
III. The Diptychs of the Living at the Pontifical Liturgy . . . 13
1. The Medieval Manuscripts 13
2. A Modern Text from Jersualem 15
3. Present Usage 16
a. The Patriarchal Liturgy 16
b. The Episcopal Liturgy 17
IV. The Exclamation Καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν/*I vsex i vsja* . . 18

CONCLUSION 19

Chapter II. THE BACKGROUND: EASTERN LITURGICAL DIPTYCHS IN THE EARLY SOURCES 23

A. THE STATE OF THE QUESTION 23
I. Preces, Intercessions, Diptychs 23
II. The Original Place of the Diptychs 27
III. Intercessions and Diptychs – How they Differ 30

B. The nomina in the early sources 32
1. Ignatius of Antioch 33
2. Cyprian of Carthage 33

C. The sources of late antiquity 34
I. Egypt 34
1. The Euchology of Sarapion 34
2. The Strasbourg Papyrus 35
3. Didascalia Arabica 36
II. Palestine 37
1. Cyril of Jerusalem 37
2. Jerome 38
3. Testamentum Domini 39
III. Cyprus 40
IV. Antiochia 41
1. The Apostolic Constitutions 41
2. Theodore of Mopsuestia 41
3. John Chrysostom 41
V. Cilicia 47
1. Theodore of Mopsuestia 47
2. Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite 48
3. The Synod of Mopsuestia in 550 49
VI. West-Syrian Mesopotamia 53
1. Jacob of Sarug 53
2.The Canons of Marutha 55
VII. East-Syrian Mesopotamia 56
1. Narsai 56
2. Gabriel of Basra 57

Conclusion 58

Chapter III. THE DIPTYCHS BEYOND BYZANTIUM 61

A. Palestine 61
I. The Hagiopolite Diptychs in Codex Sinai Gr. 1040 61
II. The Metrical Diptychs of Codex Sabas 153 65
III. Conclusion A: The Palestinian Diptychs of St. James . . 65

B. The armenian diptychs 66
I. The Patarag 66
II. The Armenian Liturgical Commentators 69
1. Xosrov Anjewac'i 69
2. Nerses Lambronac'i 69
3. Yovhannes Arčišec'i 70
III. Conclusion B: The Armenian Diptychs 70

C. Syria and Mesopotamia 71
I. The Diptychs of Mesopotamia and *The Book of Life* . . . 71
1. The Commentators 71

2. Later Mesopotamian Sources 72
3. Maronite Šarar 73
II. The Syro-Antiochene Diptychs 74
III. Conclusion C: The Diptychs in the Syriac Sources 75

D. The diptychs in Egypt 76
I. The Coptic Intercessions Today 77
II. The Ethiopian Diptychs 78
III. The Lamp of Darkness 78
IV. The Diptychal Fragments 79
1. Papyrus Cairo 10395A 81
2. Papyrus Berlin 3602 81
3. The Luxor Diptych 83
4. The Boston Diptych 85
5. The Vienna Papyrus 85
6. Coptica Lovaniensia 28 86
7. The Diptychs in Codex British Library Add. 17195 . 87
8. Papyrus London 514 88
9. Papyrus London 513 89
10. Papyrus London 155 90
11. Papyrus London 971 91
V. Conclusion D: The Diptychs in Egypt 91

Chapter IV. THE BYZANTINE DIPTYCHS OF THE DEAD: HISTORY AND LITURGY 95

A. The historical sources 95
I. John Chrysostom 95
1. Homily 21 on the Acts of the Apostles 95
2. Chrysostom and the Diptychs in Exile and Death . . 97
II. Later Sources 100
1. The Theotokos Commemoration 100
2. The Synod of Constantinople in 518 102
3. Maximus Confessor 103

B. The liturgical sources 105
I. The Prothcoria 105
II. Diptychal Remnants in the Liturgical Sources 107
1. The Version of Leo Tuscan 107
2. The Euchology and Diataxis Manuscripts 108
III. The Degeneration of the Diptychs 110
1. The Euchologies and Diataxeis 110
2. The "Diptych" of Cozza-Luzi 113
IV. An Italo-Greek Diptych 114
V. The Editio Princeps of the Melkite Qundaq 115

VI. Where Were the Diptychs of the Dead Proclaimed? . . . 117
VII. Excursus: The Theotokos Heirmos Ἄξιόν ἐστιν 117

Conclusion 119

Chapter V. THE BYZANTINE DIPTYCHS OF THE LIVING: HISTORY AND LITURGY 121

A. The historical sources 121
I. The Hierarchy 1: Intercclesial Commemorations between Patriarchates 121
1. The Early Monophysite Controversy 121
2. The Acacian Schism (484-519) 122
3. The Three Chapters and Constantinople II 124
4. Later Sources: Relations with Rome 124
5. Denouement: The Union of Florence (1439) 126
II. The Hierarchy 2: Intereparchial Commemorations within Patriarchates 130
1. Within the Patriarchate of Antioch 131
2. Within the Patriarchate of Constantinople 131
III. The Hierarchy 3: Local Eparchial Diptychs 132
IV. Commemoration of the Sovereigns 134

B. The liturgical sources 134
I. The Opening Ekphonesis of the Presider 134
1. The Textus Receptus 135
2. The Italo-Greek Peculiarity 138
3. The Placement of the Ekphonesis 139
II. The Diaconal Diptychs 140
1. The Euchology Manuscripts 140
a. Grottaferrata Gb IV 140
b. Sinai Greek 958 141
c. Oxford Bodleian Auct. E.5.13 141
d. The Textus Receptus 141
2. The Manuscripts of the Diakonikon 142
a. Sinai Greek 1040 142
b. Paris Greek 2509 143
3. The Latin Version of Leo Tuscan 144
4. The Diataxeis 146
a. Moscow Synod Greek 381 (275) 146
b. Vatican Greek 573 146
c. Vatopedi 133 (744) 147
5. The Editio Princeps of the Melkite Qundaq 147
III. Later Refinements in the Pontifical Diptychs 148
1. The Early Arabic Version of CHR 148
2. The Archieratikon of Gemistos 150
3. The Diary of Archdeacon Paul of Aleppo 151

4. The *Proskinitarij* of Arsenij Suxanov 152
5. The Diataxis of Patriarch Athanasius III 153
6. The Činovnik of Cholmogory 154
7. The Činovnik of Moscow, 1668 155
IV. The Concession of the Anaphora to Abbots 155
V. Variants in the Exclamation Καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν . . . 156
VI. Where Were the Diptychs of the Living Proclaimed? . . . 156
CONCLUSION 158

Excursus. THE GREEK TEXT OF THE DIACONAL DIPTYCHS OF THE LIVING 161

Chapter VI. QUAESTIONES DISPUTATAE IN THE BYZANTINE DIPTYCHS: WHO, WHERE, AND IN WHAT SEQUENCE? . . 165

A. WHO WAS NAMED IN THE BYZANTINE DIPTYCHS? 165
I. The Diptychs of the Living 167
1. Hierarchical Dignitaries 167
2. The Sovereigns 168
II. The Diptychs of the Dead 169
1. The Hierarchy 169
2. The Sovereigns 170
III. The Inclusion of the Councils in the Diptychs 171
IV. Were Any Others named in the Diptychs? 172

B. THE ORIGINAL PLACE AND SEQUENCE OF THE DIPTYCHS IN THE BYZANTINE LITURGY 173
I. John Chrysostom 173
II. Maximus Confessor 175
III. The Synod of Constantinople in 518 178
IV. The Letter to Pope Hormisdas 179
V. The Letter of James of Edessa 181

CONCLUSION 182

VII. Conclusion. A TAXONOMY OF DIPTYCHS 185
Placement 185
Types of Diptychs 186
1. Hierarchical Diptychs 187
2. Communion Diptychs 188
3. Confessional Diptychs 188
4. Mixed Diptychs 189
Structural Characteristics 189
1. Antioch 189
2. Jerusalem 190
3. Alexandria 190
Why Diptychs? 190

Rise and Decline 192
Pastoral Considerations 194

INDEX OF MANUSCRIPTS 197

GENERAL INDEX 201

ABBREVIATIONS AND WORKS CITED
IN ABBREVIATED FORM

AB = *Analecta Bollandiana.*

ACO = E. SCHWARTZ, J. STRAUB (eds.), *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, Berlin/Leipzig 1922-.

ALW = *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft.*

ApConst = *The Apostolic Constitutions*, ed. M. METZGER, *Les Constitutions apostoliques*, t. I: livres I-II (SC 320) Paris 1985; t. II: livres III-VI (SC 329) Paris 1986; t. III: livres VII-VIII (SC 336) Paris 1987.

APSyr = The Syriac Anaphora of the Twelve Apostles, related to CHR, ed. A. RAES, AS I.2:203-227.

ApTrad = *The Apostolic Tradition*, see BOTTE.

ARRANZ, *Typicon* = M. ARRANZ, *Le Typicon du Monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine. Codex Messinensis gr. 115, A.D. 1131. Introduction, texte critique et notes* (OCA 185) Rome 1969.

AS I-III = *Anaphorae Syriacae*, quotquot in codicibus adhuc repertae sunt, cura Pontificii Instituti Studiorum Orientalium editae et latinae versae, vols. I-III, Rome 1939-.

BACHA = C. BACHA, "Notions générales sur les versions arabes de la Liturgie de S. Jean Chrysostome suivies d'une ancienne version inédite," *XPYCOCTOMIKA* 401-471.

BAS = The Greek Liturgy of St. Basil, in its Byzantine redaction unless otherwise specified; see EgBAS, UrBAS.

BASTIANINI-GALLAZZI = G. BASTIANINI, C. GALLAZZI, "P. Cair. 10395A: frammento liturgico," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 58 (1985) 99-102.

BECK = H.-G. BECK, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*, Munich 1959.

BEDJAN I-V = P. BEDJAN, *Homiliae selectae Mar-Jacobi Sarugensis*, 5 vols. Paris/Leipzig 1905-1910.

BELS = Bibliotheca *Ephemerides liturgicae*, Subsidia.

BELS 19 = B. SPINKS (ed.), *The Sacrifice of Praise. Studies on the Themes of Thanksgiving and Redemption in the Central Prayers of the Eucharistic and Baptismal Liturgies. In Honour of Arthur Hubert Couratin* (BELS 19) Rome 1981.

BEW = R. TAFT, *Beyond East and West. Problems in Liturgical Understanding*, Washington D.C. 1984.

BIDEZ-PARMENTIER = J. BIDEZ, L. PARMENTIER, *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius with Scholia*, London 1898.

BISHOP, "Appendix" = E. BISHOP, "Appendix" to CONNOLLY, *Narsai* (q.v.).

BISHOP, "Comments" I-IX = ID., "Liturgical Comments and Memoranda," I: JTS 10 (1909) 446-49; III: JTS 11 (1910) 67-73; IV-VII: JTS 12 (1911) 384-413; VIII-IX: JTS 14 (1913) 23-50.

BKV = Bibliothek der Kirchenväter.

BONA = J. BONA, *Rerum liturgicarum libri duo*, III, Turin 1753, 260-71.

BORNERT, *Commentaires* = R. BORNERT, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie du VIIe au XVe siècle* (AOC 9) Paris 1966.

BOTTE = B. BOTTE, *La Tradition apostolique de S. Hippolyte. Essai de reconstitution* (LQF 39) Münster 1963.

BRAKMANN, "Basileios-Liturgie" = H. BRAKMANN, "Zu den Fragmenten einer griechischen Basileios-Liturgie aus dem koptischen Makarios-Kloster," OC 66 (1982) 118-143.

BRAKMANN, "Severos" = ID., "Severos unter den Alexandrinern. Zum liturgischen Diptychon in Boston," JAC 26 (1983) 54-58.

BROCK = S. BROCK, "Tenth-century Diptychs of the Coptic Orthodox Church in a Syriac Manuscript." *Bulletin de la Société d'archéologie copte* 26 (1984) 23-29.

BZ = *Byzantinische Zeitschrift.*

CABIÉ = R. CABIÉ (ed.), *La lettre du Pape Innocent Ier à Décentius de Gubbio (19 mars 416)* (Bibliothèque de la *Revue d'Histoire ecclésiastique*, fasc. 58) Louvain 1973.

CABROL, "Diptyques" = F. CABROL, "Diptyques (liturgie)," DACL IV.1:1045-1094.

CATERGIAN-DASHIAN = Y. GAT'RČEAN, *Srbajan pataragamatoyc'k' Hayoc' (K'nnakan hratarakakut'iun matenagrut'ean maxneac' hayoc'*. I) = J. CATERGIAN, *Die Liturgien bei den Armeniern. Fünfzehn Texte und Untersuchungen*, ed. J. DASHIAN [Y. TAŠEAN] (in Armenian) Vienna 1897.

CCL = Corpus Christianorum Latinorum.

CFDS - Concilium Florentinum documenta et scriptores, 11 vols. Rome 1940-1976.

CHR = The Byzantine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom.

Čin arxierejskago dejstva = *Čin arxierejskago dejstva Božestvennyx liturgij, i osvjaščenija antimijsov i cerkvej*, Moscow 1668.

Činovnik of Cholmogory = A.P. GOLUBCEV (ed.), "Činovnik Xolmogorskago Preobraženskago Sobora, s predisloviem i ukazatelem," ČtOIDR 1903 (4) 13-30.

CONNOLLY, "The Book of Life" = R.H. CONNOLLY, "The Book of Life," JTS 13 (1912) 580-594.

CONNOLLY, "Homily on the Memorial" = ID., "A Homily of Mâr Jacob of Sérûgh on the Memorial of the Departed and on the Eucharistic Loaf," *Downside Review* 29 (1910) 260-270 = BEDJAN I, 535-550.

CONNOLLY, "Homily on the Mysteries" = ID., "A Homily of Mâr Jacob of Serûgh on the Reception of the Holy Mysteries," *Downside Review* 27 (1908) 278-287 = BEDJAN III, 646-663.

CONNOLLY, "Innocent I" = ID., "Pope Innocent I 'De nominibus recitandis'," JTS 20 (1919) 215-226.

CONNOLLY, *Narsai* = *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, translated into English with an introduction by R.H. CONNOLLY. With an appendix by Edmund BISHOP (Texts and Studies VIII.1) Cambridge 1909.

CONNOLLY-CODRINGTON = *Two Commentaries on the Jacobite Liturgy by George, Bishop of the Arab Tribes and Moses Bar Kepha, together with the Syriac Anaphora of St. James and a document entitled The Book of Life*. Text and English trans. by R.H. CONNOLLY and W.H. CODRINGTON, London 1913.

COZZA-LUZI, "De sacris collybis et diptychis" = G. COZZA-LUZI, "De sacris collybis et diptychis," in A. MAI, *Nova patrum bibliotheca* X.2, Rome 1905, 138-143.

CRUM *Catalogue* = W.E. CRUM, *Catalogue of the Coptic Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London 1905).

CRUM, "Diptych" = ID., "A Greek Diptych of the Seventh Century," PSBA 30 (1908) 255-265.

CSCO = Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium.

ČtOIDR = *Čtenija v Imperatorskom obščestve istorii i drevnostej Rossijskix pri Moskovskom Universitete*.

CUMING = G.J. CUMING, *The Liturgy of St Mark, edited from the manuscripts with a commentary* (OCA 234) Rome 1990.

DACL = *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*.

DARROUZÈS = J. DARROUZÈS, *Recherches sur les* ὀφφίκια de l'Église byzantine (Archives de l'Orient chrétien 11) Paris 1970.

Dejanija = *Dejanija moskovskix soborov 1666-1667 godov*, II: *Kniga sobornyx dejanij 1667 goda*, Moscow 1893.

DE MEESTER, *De monachico statu* = P. DE MEESTER, *De monachico statu iuxta disciplinam Byzantinam* (FCCO, serie II, fasc. X) Vatican 1942.

DESCOEUDRES = G. DESCOEUDRES, *Die Pastophorien im syro-byzantinischen Osten. Eine Untersuchung zu architektur- und liturgiegeschichtlichen Problemen* (Schriften zur Geistesgeschichte des östlichen Europa, Bd. 16) Wiesbaden 1983.

PS.-DIONYSIUS, EH = DIONYSIUS THE PSEUDO-AREOPAGITE, *The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, PG 3:369-569.

DIX, *Shape* = G. DIX, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, Westminster 1945.

DMITR I=III = A. DMITRIEVSKIJ, *Opisanie liturgičeskix rukopisej xranjaščixsja v bibliotekax pravoslavnago vostoka*, I-II, Kiev 1895, 1901; III, Petrograd 1917.

DOP = *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*.

DORESSE-LANNE = J. DORESSE, E. LANNE, *Un témoin archaique de la liturgie copte de S. Basile* (Bibliothèque du *Muséon* 47) Louvain 1960.

EgBAS = The Alexandrian redaction of BAS, in Greek and Coptic; see DORESSE-LANNE; pp. 347-357.

EL = *Ephemerides Liturgicae*.

EO = *Echos d'Orient*.

EVERY = G. EVERY, *The Byzantine Patriarchate, 451-1204*, 2nd, revised ed. London 1962.

FCCO = Pontificia Commissione per la redazione del Codice di diritto canonico orientale, *Codificazione orientale: Fonti*, Vatican 1930-.

FEDALTO I-II = G. FEDALTO, *Hierarchia Ecclesiastica Orientalis*, 2 vols. I: *Patriarchatus Constantinopolitanus*; II: *Patriarchatus Alexandrinus, Antiochenus, Hierosolymitanus*, Padua 1988.

FIEY, "Diocèses" = J.-M. FIEY, "Les diocèses du 'Maphrianat' syrien," PDO 5 (1974) 133-64, 331-93; 8 (1977-78) 347-78.

FIEY, "Diptyques" = ID., "Diptyques nestoriens du XIVe siècle," AB 81 (1963) 371-413.

FORTESCUE = A. FORTESCUE, *The Reunion Formula of Hormisdas* (Unity Studies 16) Graymoor, Garrison N. Y. 1955.

FUNK I-II = F.X. FUNK, *Didascalia et Constitutiones apostolorum*, 2 vols. Paderborn 1905.

GCS = Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte.

GCS 44 = THEODORET, *Kirchengeschichte*, 2nd ed., ed. L. PARMENTIER, F. SCHEIDWEILER (GCS 44 [19]) Berlin 1954.

GCS 52 = THEODOROS ANAGNOSTES, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G.CH. HANSEN (GCS 52) Berlin 1971.

GERHARDS = A. GERHARDS, *Die griechische Gregoriosanaphora. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Eucharistischen Hochgebets* (LQF 65) Münster 1984.

GILL = J. GILL, *The Council of Florence*, Cambridge 1959.

GOAR = J. GOAR, *Εὐχολόγιον sive Rituale Graecorum complectens ritus et ordines Divinae Liturgiae, officiorum, sacramentorum, consecrationum, benedictionum, funerum, orationum, &c. cuilibet personae, statu vel tempori congruos, juxta usum Orientalis Ecclesiae...* editio secunda expurgata, et accuratior, Venice 1730, reprinted Graz 1960.

GOLUBCEV = A.P. GOLUBCEV (ed.), "Činovnik Xolmogorskago Preobraženskago Sobora, s predisloviem i ukazatelem," ČtOIDR 1903 (4) 13-30.

GORI = A.F. GORI, *Thesaurus veterum diptychorum consularium et ecclesiasticorum...* Florence 1759.

GRAF I-V = G. GRAF, *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur* I (ST 118) Vatican 1944; II (ST 133) 1947; III (ST 146) 1949; IV (ST 147) 1951; V (ST 172) 1953.

GREG = The Alexandrian Greek Liturgy of St. Gregory (see GERHARDS).

GRISBROOKE, "Intercession" I, II.1, II.2 = W.J. GRISBROOKE, "Intercession at the Eucharist" I, *Studia Liturgica* 4 (1965) 129-55; II.1, 5 (1966) 20-44; II.2, 5 (1966) 87-103.

HE = *Historia ecclesiastica.*

HINDO, *Appendice* I-II = P. HINDO, *Disciplina Antiochena antica, Siri* II: *Les personnes* (FCCO series 2, fasc. 26, Rome 1951), *Appendice* I: *Juridiction territoriale du Patriarche d'Antioche*, 425-515; *Appendice* II: *Éparchies du Maphrianat*, 517-528.

HOFMANN, CFDS III.3 = G. HOFMANN (ed.), *Orientalium documenta minora* (CFDS III.3) Rome 1953.

HOLTZMANN = W. HOLTZMANN, "Die Unionsverhandlungen zwischen Kaiser Alexios I. und Papst Urban II. im Jahre 1089," BZ 28 (1928) 38-67.

HONIGMANN = E. HONIGMANN, *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VIe siècle* (CSCO 127, subs. 2) Louvain 1951.

HUCULAK = L.D. HUCULAK, OSBM, *The Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in the Kievan Metropolitan Province during the Period of Union with Rome (1596-1805)* (Analecta OSBM, Series 2, Sectio 1, vol. 47) Rome 1990.

HUSSEY= J.M. HUSSEY, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire* (Oxford History of the Christian Church) Oxford 1986.

INGLISIAN = V. INGLISIAN, *Die armenische Literatur*, in B. SPULER (ed.), *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, Abteilung 1: *Der nahe und der mittlere Osten*, Bd. 7: *Armenische und kaukasische Sprachen*, Leiden/Cologne 1963, 155-254.

IVANOVSKIJ = N.I. IVANOVSKIJ (ed.), *Proskinitarij Arsenija Suxanova, 1649-1653 gg.* PPSb 7 (1899) *vypusk* 3.

JAC = *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum.*

JACOB, "Concélébration" = A. JACOB, "La concélébration de l'anaphore à Byzance d'après le témoignage de Léon Toscan," OCP 35 (1969) 249-256.

JACOB, "Euchologe" = ID., "Un euchologe du Saint-Sauveur «in Lingua Phari» de Messine. Le Bodleianus Auct. E.5.13," *Bulletin de l'Institut historique belge de Rome* 50 (1980) 183-346.

JACOB, *Formulaire* = ID., *Histoire du formulaire grec de la Liturgie de Saint Jean Chrysostome*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Louvain 1968.

JACOB, "Otrante" = ID., "La traduction de la Liturgie de S. Basile par Nicolas d'Otrante," *Bulletin de l'Institut historique belge de Rome* 38 (1967) 49-107.

JACOB, "Toscan" = ID., "La traduction de la Liturgie de S. Jean Chrysostome par Léon Toscan. Edition critique," OCP 32 (1966) 111-162.

JACOB, "Tradition" = ID., "La tradition manuscrite de la Liturgie de S. Jean Chrysostome (VIIe-XIIe siècles)," in *Eucharisties d'orient et d'occident* 2 (Lex orandi 47) Paris 1970, 109-138.

JACOB, "Version géorgienne" = ID., "Une version géorgienne inédite de la Liturgie de S. Jean Chrysostome," Mus 77 (1964) 65-117.

JAMMO, *La messe chaldéenne* = S.Y.H. JAMMO, *La structure de la messe chaldéenne* (OCA 207) Rome 1979.

JAS = The Greek Liturgy of St. James, ed. B.-CH. MERCIER, *La Liturgie de S. Jacques. Edition critique, avec traduction latine* (PO 26.2) Paris 1946, 115-256.

JC = R.C.D. JASPER and G.J. CUMING, *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed. Texts translated and edited with commentary*, 3rd ed. New York 1987.

JTS = *The Journal of Theological Studies.*

JUNGMANN, MS I-II = J.A. JUNGMANN, *The Mass of the Roman Rite. Missarum sollemnia*, 2 vols. New York 1951, 1955.

KARLIN-HAYTER = P. KARLIN-HAYTER (ed.), *Vita Euthymii Patriarchae CP*, text, trans., intro. and commentary (Bibliothèque de *Byzantion* 3) Brussels 1970.

KM = N.F. KRASNOSEL'CEV, *Materialy dlja istorii činoposledovanija Liturgii Svjatago Ioanna Zlatoustago*, Kazan 1889.

KOEP = L. KOEP, *Das himmlische Buch in Antike und Christentum. Eine reli-*

gionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur altchristlichen Bildersprache (Theophaneia 8) Bonn 1952.

KOROLEVSKY, *Histoire* = C. KOROLEVSKY (C. KARALEVSKY), *Histoire des patriarcats melkites (Alexandrie, Antioche, Jérusalem) depuis le schisme monophysite du sixième siècle jusqu'à nos jours*, II-III, Rome 1910-1911.

KOROLEVSKY, "Le rite byzantin" = C. CHARON (=ID.), "Le rite byzantin et la liturgie chrysostomienne dans les patriarcats melkites (Alexandrie-Antioche-Jérusalem)," *XPYCOCTOMIKA* 473-718.

KS = N.F. KRASNOSEL'CEV, *Svedenija o nekotoryx liturgičeskix rukopisjax Vatikanskoj Biblioteki*, Kazan 1885.

LAURENT, CFDS IX = V. LAURENT (ed.), *Les «Mémoires» du Grande Ecclésiarque de l'Église de Constantinople Sylvestre Syropoulos sur le Concile de Florence (1438-1439)* (CFDS IX) Rome 1971.

LECLERCQ = H. LECLERCQ, "Diptyques (archéologie)," DACL IV.1:1094-1170.

LEFORT, "Coptica Lovaniensia" = L. TH. LEFORT, "Coptica Lovaniensia," Mus 53 (1940) 1-66.

LEW = F.E. BRIGHTMAN, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford 1896.

LIDDELL-SCOTT = H.G. LIDDELL, R. SCOTT, *A Greek English Lexicon*, new (9th) ed. Oxford 1966.

LQF = Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen.

MACOMBER = W.F. MACOMBER, "The Oldest Known Text of the Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari," OCP 32 (1966) 335-371.

MANSI = J.D. MANSI, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*.

MATEOS, *Célébration* = J. MATEOS, *La célébration de la parole dans la liturgie byzantine* (OCA 191) Rome 1971.

MCCORMICK = M. MCCORMICK, "A Liturgical Diptych from Coptic Egypt in the Museum of Fine Arts," Mus 94 (1981) 47-54.

MELIA = E. MELIA, *Les diptyques liturgiques et leur signification ecclésiologique*, in A.M. TRIACCA, A. PISTOIA (eds.), *L'église dans la liturgie* (BELS 18) Rome 1980, 209-229.

MERCIER, see JAS.

MEYER, *Eucharistie* = H.B. MEYER, *Eucharistie. Geschichte, Theologie, Pastoral*, mit einem Beitrag von Irmgard PAHL (Gottesdienst der Kirche. Handbuch der Liturgiewissenschaft, Teil 4.) Regensburg 1989.

MGH = Monumenta Germaniae Historica.

MICHEL I-II = A. MICHEL, *Humbert und Kerullarios*, 2 vols. (Quellen und Forschungen aus dem Gebiete der Geschichte 21, 23) Paderborn 1924, 1930.

MINGANA = A. MINGANA, *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Lord's Prayer and on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist* (Woodbrooke Studies 6) Cambridge 1933.

MK = The Alexandrian Greek Liturgy of St. Mark (see CUMING).

MM I-VI = F. MIKLOSICH, J. MÜLLER, *Acta et diplomata Graeca medii aevi sacra et profana*, 6 vols. Vienna 1860-1890.

Mus = *Le Muséon*.

OC= *Oriens Christianus*.

OCA = Orientalia Christiana Analecta.

OCP = *Orientalia Christiana Periodica.*

OKS = *Ostkirchliche Studien.*

ORLOV = M.I. ORLOV, *Liturgija sv. Vasilija Velikago,* St. Petersburg 1909.

PASSARELLI = G. PASSARELLI, *L'eucologio Cryptense Γ.β. VII (sec. X)* (Analekta Vlatadon 36) Thessalonika 1982.

PAULY-WISSOWA = PAULY-WISSOWA, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft.*

PDO = *Parole de l'Orient.*

PE = A. HÄNGGI, I. PAHL, *Prex eucharistica* (Spicilegium Friburgense 12) Fribourg 1968.

PO = Patrologia Orientalis.

PO 26.2, see JAS.

PPSb = *Pravoslavnyj Palestinskij Sbornik.*

PRES = The Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, in the Byzantine Greek redaction unless otherwise specified.

PSBA = *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology.*

RAC = *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum.*

RAHMANI, see *TestDom.*

REB = *Revue des études byzantines.*

Reg = *Les Regestes des actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople: Les actes des patriarches* (Le Patriarcat byzantin, série I) vol. I, fasc. 1-3, ed. V. GRUMEL, Kadiköy-Istanbul 1932, 1936; Bucharest 1947 (fasc. 1, 2nd ed., Paris 1972); fasc. 4, ed. V. LAURENT, Paris 1971; fasc. 5-6, ed. J. DARROUZÈS, Paris 1977, 1979 (references are to the documents, which are numbered consecutively throughout).

SAKKELION = I. SAKKELION, "Περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν προνομίων τῆς νήσου Πάτμου," *Εὐαγγελικὸς Κῆρυξ* 7 (1863) 317-329.

SC - Sources chrétiennes.

SC 126bis = CYRILLE DE JÉRUSALEM, *Catéchèses mystagogiques,* introduction, texte critique et notes de A. PIÉDAGNEL, traduction de P. PARIS (SC 126bis) Paris 1988.

SC 320, 329, 336 = *ApConst,* q.v.

SH = Subsidia hagiographica.

SL = *Studia Liturgica.*

ST = Studi e testi.

ST 145 = R. TONNEAU, R. DEVREESSE, *Les homélies catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste* (ST 145) Vatican 1949.

STEGMÜLLER = O. STEGMÜLLER, *Diptychen,* RAC 3 (1957) 1138-49.

SyrJAS = The Syriac (Jacobite) redaction of the Liturgy of St. James.

SYROPOULOS = chapter references in Sylvester SYROPOULOS, *Memoirs,* ed. LAURENT, q.v.

TAFT, "Authenticity" = R. TAFT, "The Authenticity of the Chrysostom Anaphora Revisited. Determining the Authorship of Liturgical Texts by Computer," OCA 56 (1990) 5-51.

TAFT, "Bema" = ID., "Some Notes on the Bema in the East and West Syrian Traditions," OCP 34 (1968) 326-359.

TAFT, *Great Entrance* = ID., *The Great Entrance. A History of the Transfer of Gifts and Other Preanaphoral Rites of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom* (OCA 200) 2nd ed. Rome 1978.

TAFT, *Hours* = ID., *The Liturgy of the Hours in East and West. The Origins of the Divine Office and Its Meaning for Today*, Collegeville MN 1985.

TAFT, "How Liturgies Grow" = ID., "How Liturgies Grow: The Evolution of the Byzantine Divine Liturgy," BEW 167-192.

TAFT, "The Litany" = ID., "The Litany following the Anaphora in the Byzantine Liturgy," in W. NYSSEN (ed.), *Simandron. Der Wachklopfer. Gedenkschrift für Klaus Gamber (1919-1989)* (Cologne 1989) 233-56.

TAFT, "The Liturgy of the Great Church" = ID., "The Liturgy of the Great Church: An Initial Synthesis of Structure and Interpretation on the Eve of Iconoclasm," DOP 34-35 (1980-1981) 45-75.

TAFT, "Mt. Athos" = ID., "Mount Athos: A Late Chapter in the History of the 'Byzantine Rite'," DOP 42 (1988) 179-194.

TAFT, "Pontifical Liturgy" I-II = ID., "The Pontifical Liturgy of the Great Church according to a Twelfth-Century Diataxis in Codex *British Museum Add. 34060*," I: OCP 45 (1979) 279-307; II: 46 (1980) 89-124.

TALBOT = A.-M. MAFFRY TALBOT (ed.), *The Correspondence of Athanasius I, Patriarch of Constantinople* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 7 = Dumbarton Oaks Texts 3) Washington D.C. 1975.

TestDom = *Testamentum domini nostri Jesu Christi*, ed. I.E. RAHMANI, Mainz 1899.

TREMPELAS = P.N. TREMPELAS, *Αἱ τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Ἀθήναις κώδικας* (Texte und Forschungen zur byzantinisch-neugriechischen Philologie 15) Athens 1935.

UrBAS = The primitive redaction of (Eg)BAS, edited by DORESSE-LANNE, q.v.

URBINA = I. ORTIZ DE URBINA, *Patrologia Syriaca*, 2nd ed. Rome 1965.

VAN DE PAVERD, "Intercessions" = F. VAN DE PAVERD, "Anaphoral Intercessions, Epiclesis and Communion Rites in John Chrysostom," OCP 49 (1983) 303-339.

VAN DE PAVERD, *Meßliturgie* = ID., *Zur Geschichte der Meßliturgie in Antiocheia und Konstantinopel gegen Ende des vierten Jahrhunderts. Analyse der Quellen bei Johannes Chrysostomos* (OCA 187) Rome 1970.

VERPEAUX = PS.-KODINOS, *Traité des offices*, ed. J. VERPEAUX, Paris 1966.

VH = J. VAN HAELST, *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens* (Université de Paris IV, Paris-Sorbonne, Série «Papyrologie» - 1) Paris 1976.

VILLECOURT I-III = L. VILLECOURT, "Les observances liturgiques et la discipline du jeûne dans l'église copte," I: Mus 36 (1923) 249-292; II: 37 (1924) 201-280; III: 38 (1925) 261-320.

VOGT, texte I-II; commentaire I-II = A. VOGT (ed.), *Le Livre des cérémonies de Constantin Porphyrogénète*, texte I-II, Paris 1935, 1939; commentaire I-II, Paris 1935, 1940.

VON BALTHASAR, "Dionysius-Scholien" = H.U. VON BALTHASAR, "Das Problem der Dionysius-Scholien," in ID., *Kosmische Liturgie. Das Weltbild Maximus' des Bekenners*, 2nd ed. Einsiedeln 1961, 644-672.

WINKLER, "Interzessionen" I-II = G. WINKLER, "Die Interzessionen der Chrysos-

tomusanaphora in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung," I: OCP 36 (1970) 301-336; II: OCP 37 (1971) 333-383.

WINKLER, "Randbemerkungen" = ID., "Einige Randbemerkungen zu den Interzessionen in Antiochien und Konstantinopel im 4. Jahrhundert," OKS 20 (1971) 55-61.

XPYCOCTOMIKA = *XPYCOCTOMIKA. Studi e ricerche intorno a S. Giovanni Crisostomo*, a cura del comitato per il XV° centenario della sua morte, 407-1907, Rome 1908.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Part of the research and writing of this monograph was done during my tenure as Summer Fellow in Byzantine Studies at the Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies in Washington, D.C. This was the second time I was privileged to enjoy the hospitality and stimulating intellectual atmosphere of that unparalleled center of culture and research. For I had worked there on volumes II and V of this same history as Fellow in Byzantine Studies during the 1984-1985 academic year. I wish to express my gratitude to the Trustees for Harvard University who awarded me these fellowships; to the then Director of Dumbarton Oaks, Prof. Robert W. Thomson, and the then Assistant Director Dr. Judy Ullmann Siggins; to Dr. Irene Vaslef, Librarian of the Byzantine Library and her staff, especially Jill Bonner and Mark Zapatka, for their always friendly and speedy help in locating publications and in acquiring interlibrary loan materials; to the Research Associates and Project Directors, especially Alexander Kazhdan, John Callahan, and Michael McCormick, ever ready to help when asked for assistance or advice; and indeed to the entire staff and community of Fellows and Junior Fellows, for their stimulating companionship and unfailing kindness and cooperation.

My debt to the previous work of Prof. Gabriele Winkler on the intercessions of the Chrysostom Anaphora will be evident from my frequent references to her study. I am also grateful to my student Stefano Parenti for several references and suggestions.

INTRODUCTION

> "Where shall I begin, please your majesty," he asked. "Begin at the beginning," the King said gravely, "and go on until you come to the end: then stop." (Lewis CARROLL, *Alice in Wonderland*).

Sound advice indeed. Alas, what is feasible in the more easily controllable realm of fantasy is not always so in reality. That is why this book is listed as volume IV of *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, even though that title appears here for the first time. My study of the prenaphoral rites, *The Great Entrance*, published in this same series, OCA 200 (Rome 1975, 2nd ed. 1978), actually comprises volume II of this history, now planned in five volumes. Volume III, *The Anaphora*, almost completed, will deal with the eucharistic prayer from the preanaphoral dialogue until the final doxology.[1] Volume V, much of which is already written too, will treat the precommunion, communion, thanksgiving, and dismissal rites. Then in volume I, if I live long enough, I shall revise and update the Liturgy of the Word, already studied by my mentor Juan Mateos, S.J., *La célébration de la Parole dans la liturgie byzantine. Étude historique* (OCA 191, Rome 1971).

By proceeding in this way, I am following a longstanding tradition in the field. F.E. Brightman published in 1896 his still indispensable *Liturgies Eastern and Western* under the subtitle Vol. I. *Eastern Liturgies* – though no second volume ever appeared. Closer to home, one of my confrères and predecessors as Professor of Eastern Liturgy at the Pontifical Oriental Institute, J.-M. Hanssens, S.J. (†1976), published in Rome in 1930-1932, volumes II-III of another classic, his *Institutiones liturgicae de ritibus orientalibus* – in this case, too, the only volumes ever to see the light of day.

Lest anyone think I have been idle since the publication of that first – i.e. II – volume in 1975, let me say that twelve chapters of vols.

[1] I.e. LEW 383.27-390.7.

III and V have already appeared or are in press as articles. I list them here in the sequence they will have in the respective volumes.

Volume III:

1. "Textual Problems in the Diaconal Admonition before the Anaphora in the Byzantine Tradition," OCP 49 (1983) 340-365.
2. "The Dialogue before the Anaphora in the Byzantine Eucharistic Liturgy, I: The Opening Greeting," OCP 52 (1986) 299-324.
3. II. "The *Sursum corda*," OCP 54 (1988) 47-77.
4. III: "'Let us give thanks to the Lord – It is fitting and right'," OCP 55 (1989) 63-74.
5. "The Authenticity of the Chrysostom Anaphora Revisited. Determining the Authorship of Liturgical Texts by Computer," OCP 56 (1990) 5-51.
6. "The Fruits of Communion in the Anaphora of St. John Chrysostom," to appear in a *Festschrift* for Jordi Pinell, O.S.B. (Analecta liturgica = Studia Anselmiana, Rome 1991).

Volume V:

7. "The Litany following the Anaphora in the Byzantine Liturgy," in W. NYSSEN (ed.), *Simandron. Der Wachklopfer. Gedenkschrift für Klaus Gamber (1919-1989)* (Cologne:Luthe-Verlag 1989) 233-256.
8. "The Lord's Prayer in the Eucharistic Liturgy: When and Why?" to appear in a *Festschrift* for E.J. Kilmartin, S.J.
9. "The Inclination Prayer before Communion in the Byzantine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom: a Study in Comparative Liturgy," *Ecclesia orans* 3 (1986) 29-60.
10. "'Holy Things for the Saints'. The Ancient Call to Communion and its Response," to appear in a *Gedenkschrift* for Niels Krogh Rasmussen, O.P.
11. "Melismos and Comminution. The Fraction and its Symbolism in the Byzantine Tradition," in: G. FARNEDI (ed.), *Traditio et progressio. Studi liturgici in onore del Prof. Adrien Nocent, OSB* (Analecta liturgica 12 = Studia Anselmiana 95, Rome 1988) 531-552.
12. "Water into Wine. The Twice-mixed Chalice in the Byzantine Eucharist," Mus 100 (1987) 323-342.

The Aim and Scope of this Study

Liturgy is about praying, and not just about praying *to* but also about praying *for*. One of the traditional ways Churches in their litur-

gies have prayed for the major personages with whom their destinies are, for better or worse, intertwined are the diptychs. But praying *for* also implies whose side one is on. So liturgical diptychs were an important factor in the politico-ecclesial relations between East and West, as well as among the Orthodox Patriarchates within the Eastern (later Byzantine) Empire, from the fourth century until the end of Byzantium.

In spite of that, no one has yet attempted a detailed liturgical analysis of this important liturgical unit of Late Antique eastern liturgy.[2] That is what I propose to do, for Byzantium at least, in this monograph: study the nature, use, and ultimate decline of the Byzantine diptychs from a *liturgical* point of view. I stress *liturgical*, for in spite of their relative unimportance today – most people do not even know what liturgical diptychs are, nor do they need to – nothing liturgical was of greater political import in the world of Late-Antique and Medieval ecclesiastical relations than the Byzantine diptychs. A full analysis of the socio-political implications of the diptychs, however, would carry us beyond the scope of this study. So I shall exploit the historical sources only for what they tell us about liturgical usage, leaving the broader questions to the historians of church and state.

As part of a history of the Chrysostom liturgy, this study is directed chiefly at the liturgical diptychs of Constantinople – i.e., what we call the Byzantine Rite today. Other eastern liturgical sources, especially those from related Greek traditions within the former Byzantine Empire such as the Palestinian diptychs used in JAS, will be adduced when useful to illustrate or argue a point on the basis of comparative liturgy. But these pages do not pretend to offer new research in the ms traditions or other unpublished sources of those rites, a pretense it does entertain, however, for the Byzantine Rite, though some new insights

[2] In addition to the seminal work of BISHOP, *Appendix* 97-117, and ID., *Comments* I-IX, the basic general studies on liturgical diptychs are STEGMÜLLER and CABROL. See also F.E. BRIGHTMAN, *Chronicle*, JTS 12 (1911) 319-23; J.-M. HANSSENS, *Institutiones liturgicae de ritibus orientalibus* III (Rome 1932) 467-69; R.H. CONNOLLY, *Pope Innocent I 'De nominbus recitandis'*, JTS 20 (1919) 215-26; CABIÉ 40-44; VAN DE PAVERD, *Intercessions* 322-28; MELIA; Giuseppe COZZA-LUZI, *De sacris collybis et diptychis*, in A. MAI, *Nova patrum bibliotheca* X.2 (Rome 1905) 138-43. Among the older works, see GORI and BONA. For the Byzantine tradition the classic study remains WINKLER, "Interzessionen" I-II, though W's work deals principally with the anaphoral intercessions.

and conclusions may be hazarded even for the non-Byzantine liturgical traditions.

The Genesis of this Study

An important part of eastern liturgies since the fourth century, the diptychs have been on my mind for at least a quarter century, since the earliest days of my graduate studies in oriental liturgy at the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome. This interest was necessitated by my research on the Byzantine Great Entrance. Contradictory opinions concerning the place of the Byzantine diptychs, located by Brightman at the Great Entrance,[3] related by Baumstark to the litany following it,[4] but placed (correctly) in the anaphora by van de Paverd[5] in agreement with Edmund Bishop, led me to the seminal study of that doughty English Catholic liturgical scholar,[6] master at outlining problems and then pointing, tanatalizingly, to their solution without, however, taking the trouble to nail it down once and for all.

Once I had read Bishop's short essay "The Diptychs," [7] however, I knew that this problem would need much more attention than I could give it at the time, and a much more thorough analysis than Bishop had been willing to give it, though his insights were surely correct. So I had to be content with resolutely denying the theses of Brightman and Baumstark and their followers, and putting the rest off to a future volume with the statement, in the editorial plural academicians affected in those days but are gradually abandoning, "We hope to discuss the place of the diptychs in the liturgy of Constantinople in a later volume, when we study the anaphora of CHR."[8]

I took copious notes on Bishop's essay and the other literature, (that was still in the era B.X., before Xerox, when graduate students had to read articles, and even take notes on them, not just photocopy

[3] LEW 528.28ff; 535.35-536.7.

[4] A. BAUMSTARK, *Die Messe im Morgenland* (Munich n.d.) 177; cf. TREMPELAS 87 note 21.

[5] VAN DE PAVERD, *Meßliturgie* 502ff, 507ff, 515ff, 523-24.

[6] On this fascinating man and his career, see the excellent academic biography by Nigel ABERCROMBIE, *The Life and Work of Edmund Bishop* (London 1959).

[7] BISHOP, "Appendix," III, 97-117.

[8] TAFT, *Great Entrance* 47-50 note 113; cf. 227-28, 322.

them), salting them away for future use. For even then, callow student though I was, I could grasp not only the overriding importance the diptychs had for our forebears – but also their total lack of any importance whatever for anyone today. Now if change is the stuff of history, this was liturgical history with a vengeance, I thought, and so fundamental a shift intrigued me.

Some years later, by then a junior professor at the Pontifical Oriental Institute, I directed Gabriele Winkler to the intercessions of the Chrysostom anaphora as research topic for her licentiate thesis, and placed at her disposal my raw and undigested notes on the content of the euchology mss I had read up to that point in libraries outside of Rome, with the understanding that her research could later be incorporated into my planned volume on the Chrysostom anaphora. The reception with which this paper,[9] now recognized as the classic study on the topic, was greeted was a source of great satisfaction to me, a novice professor in his first year of graduate-school teaching, as is the continued success of its author, herself since 1977 a professor and noted scholar in her chosen field of research.

I returned to the diptychs in 1976-1977, reading some of the historical sources in free moments stolen from Coptic, Syriac, and Armenian, while I was engaged in postdoctoral studies in Oriental philology at the Institut Orientaliste of the Université Catholique de Louvain in Belgium. Finally, during the summer of 1988, on fellowship at the Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies in Washington, D.C., I dusted off my notebooks and file cards again, and this small book began to take shape as a section of that "later volume, when we study the anaphora of CHR" announced in 1975, of *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom* mentioned above. But what began as one chapter of that projected volume III, on the anaphora, soon grew into a study far too long to be simply a section of that book, necessitating its publication separately as volume IV.

Comparative Liturgy at the Bar: A Note on Method

This is a work of liturgical history. To perceive relationships, point out connections – in a word, to explain, is what I have always consid-

[9] WINKLER, "Interzessionen" I-II.

ered the work of the historian to be. Some of my conclusions are, of course, hypothetical. But that is true of all attempts at historical reconstruction, via the methods of comparative liturgy, in the absence of adequate textual evidence. The only alternative would be to renounce all attempt at writing history, and content oneself with merely describing or editing what is found in the sources.

The publication of sources or the description of their contents is not history, however, but propaedeutic to history. Unless the sources are explained, and explained by someone who knows enough about the topic to locate them within their socio-cultural and historical context, their editing does not advance our understanding of the history of liturgy one whit. Knowledge is not the accumulation of data, not even new data, but the perception of relationships, the creation of hypothetical frameworks to explain the new data, or to explain in new ways the old. For the sources do not tell us how they got the way they are, nor do later ones tell us why they are not the same as earlier ones. For that, one must examine, compare, and hypothesize, as I try to do in the following pages, in order to solve the problems the sources present. For an examination of the sources gives rise not to answers, but to questions, and the questions will not be answered by a mere description of what gave rise to them in the first place. The problems of liturgical history are not invented by the historian. They are provided by the appearance of changes in the sources themselves, be they omissions, additions, or aberrations that constitute a departure from previously established patterns.

That is why one (though by no means the only one) of the methods I use has come to be called "comparative liturgy," after the title of the work in which it was first described by Anton Baumstark, *Comparative Liturgy* (Westminster Md. 1958). When dealing with the liturgies of the past, it is only by sifting and analyzing, classifying and comparing, texts and liturgical units within and across the traditions that one can divine the direction in which things seem to be moving, chart their trajectory, and hypothesize how the gaps in the evidence might best be filled in.

All that was relatively clear to me, in my naive insouciance, until a recent stimulating, nay provocative, article confronted me with the dread possibility that I might be guilty of that most terrible of all sins: being *out of date*.[10] The "comparative, historical approach to liturgy," of which I find

[10] M.D. STRINGER, "Liturgy and Anthropology: The History of a Relationship," *Worship* 63 (1989) 503-521.

myself defined "the foremost advocate writing today,"[11] does not, apparently, tell us a great deal about the nature of liturgy, and so apart from a few throwbacks to an earlier age, "it is now very rare to find anyone advocating a comparative study of liturgy as such..."[12]

Since in contemporary liturgical circles, being out of date is almost as bad as being *irrelevant*, I may some day be forced to take up the gauntlet. But not here, not now. I have already said enough elsewhere about how I work and why[13] – my "methodology," if you will – and others have carried the analysis further.[14] So I shall leave it to the reader to judge whether or not the structural analysis of liturgies, and the comparative historical study of the liturgical units identified through such analysis, leave us knowing more about the nature and history of the Byzantine eucharistic liturgy and its diptychs than we did before. For that is all I have attempted to accomplish here.[15]

Sources

The sources used in this study will be apparent from the bibliography and references. I did not deem it necessary to reprint here the Chronological List of Manuscripts in the previous volume, which lists some two hundred mss, mostly Greek, and the location of the collections where they are preserved.[16] Since that time I have read numerous other Greek euchology mss, but they and their dates are always clearly indicated in the text or notes, as well as listed alphabetically in the Index of Manuscripts. In referring to mss I refuse, as before, to adopt the convention of citing them in Latin, since I am unable to see what purpose it serves to say Cryptofer-

[11] *Ibid.* 508 note 11.

[12] *Ibid.* 508, cf. 507.

[13] "The Structural Analysis of Liturgical Units: An Essay in Methodology," and "How Liturgies Grow: The Evolution of the Byzantine Divine Liturgy," chapters 10-11 in TAFT, BEW, 151-92.

[14] F.S. WEST, *Anton Baumstark's Comparative Liturgy in its Intellectual Context*, University of Notre Dame doctoral dissertation, April 1988 (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International 1988) Appendix II. "The Methodological Legacy of Anton Baumstark," esp. 393-400.

[15] For a more positive view of comparative liturgiology by one of its practitioners, see the survey of J.F. BALDOVIN, "Liturgiology," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 18: *Supplement 1978-1988*, 258-62.

[16] TAFT, *Great Entrance* 435-46.

ratensis or Londonensis instead of the perfectly intelligible Grottaferrata or London.

What's in a Name? A Word on Nomenclature

Years of experience in writing on Byzantine and other eastern liturgies has led me to abandon all pretense at rigid logic or uniformity in the transcription of technical terms, proper names and toponyms, from Greek, Russian, Slavonic, Syriac, and other eastern Christian languages. In general, where there is a universally accepted English form of a name, I use it. We say Finland, not Suomi; Greece, not Hellas; Albania, not Shqperia; Egypt not Misr; Moscow, not Moskva; Peter the Great, not Pëter or Pyotr; Nicholas I, not Nikolaj; Alexander II, not Aleksandr; Leo Tolstoy, not Lev Tolstoj; and I see no reason why the same rule should not apply to John Chrysostom rather than Ioannes Chrysostomos.

But even that norm cannot be adhered to rigidly without falling into absurdity. In the face of a billion Chinese should one hold to Peking instead of Beijing? Should one really say Herman instead of Germanus? Humphry for Onuphrius? Language has to do with sounds, taste has to do with sensibilities, and the latter involves subjectivity, but to me, at least, in this context Herman and Humphry sound just silly. But then why the Latinized Maximus instead of Maximos? Simply because Germanus or Maximus are, I think, more current in English usage. In some instances, where we seem caught in the middle of a usage in full evolution, I have simply made a choice and shall live with it. Should one write Salonica, Salonika, Thessalonica, Thessalonika – or follow those who live there and spell it Thessaloniki? For such Greek names, I perceive at least in present American usage a gradual move from "c" to "k," and even towards adopting the full Greek form of such names – but only up to a point. Some may write Thessaloniki, but no one writes Athenai instead of Athens, Konstantinoupolis instead of Constantinople. So one can only make one's choices as they arise, and anyone who claims to be following with absolute consistency one coherent system is deluded.

I generally use the accepted English form of a name except in specific cases where usage seems to indicate a different choice, or at least makes such a choice legitimate for a good reason. So I will write Nicholas II, not Nikolaj, for the last Russian Tsar. But in some cases I opt for a non-English form where I judge it to be the more usual one, or simply a better choice at the moment. I have no qualms about saying in the same breath

Joseph (not Iosif) of Volokolamsk and Nil Sorskij (not Nilus of Sora), inconsistent though it be, since Iosif could be thought pretentious, and is at best unnecessary, whereas Nilus, in this instance, would fly in the face of general usage.

The same inconsistency must, alas, also regulate my use of liturgical nomenclature. I say diptychs, not diptycha, antiphon, not antiphonon, because those words have a common and acceptable English form of long standing. But one cannot use the English trope for troparion, because, philology aside, they are not the same thing. Nor does the term litany suffice to distinguish a synapte from the ektene or aiteseis; a chasuble is not really a phelonion; and though an epitrachelion is a stole, and an omophorion a pallium, to use the western terms could lead to confusion. But even here I sometimes waffle. Mass is a common enough expression in English for the service of the Lord's Supper, at least in the catholic (small "c") liturgical traditions, and so I use it occasionally, for stylistic variety, in ways some might object to ("Chaldean mass"). But one cannot satisfy everyone, especially not the purists and pedants, nor has it ever been my custom even to try.

One final precision: since I am writing mainly about the liturgy of the Great Church, where I refer to a hierarch as "Patriarch," without further specification, "Patriarch *of Constantinople*" is always meant. In all other cases the respective see is specified: "Patriarch of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem."

* * *

My previous volume of this history, *The Great Entrance*, was favorably reviewed. Some were so generous as to call it "definitive." But the older one gets, the more such an epithet appears, well, too "definitive." Nothing is definitive apart from God, and all the rest is in his hands. So I will not pretend that this study is definitive. I have, however, tried to follow the admonition of Helmut Leeb in the Introduction to his study of the chants of the hagiopolite cathedral liturgy:

> In our time what is required of research in the history of the liturgy is that it produce clear, sure results. In these results, established facts must be clearly distinguished from hypotheses. Because of the refined research methods of today's liturgical scholarship, with its attention to special, detailed questions, a wide-ranging one-author work covering a large area becomes daily more problematic and impossible. Too many uncertain assertions would have to be advanced, too many hypotheses risked, just because one person can no

> longer keep in view all the diverse sciences. Today the liturgical generalist like Anton Baumstark...is becoming more and more a rarity.[17]

What makes the path especially hazardous for the historian of eastern liturgy is that there are so few συνοδοιπόροι along the way, to say nothing of ὁδηγοί, that one is perforce constrained to work alone, and in the process perhaps even violate some of the sage admonitions enunciated by Leeb. But one must begin somewhere, and *apologia* is not my genre, so instead of wringing my hands I have put them to work. The following monograph is the result. *Soit.*

[17] *Die Gesänge im Gemeindegottesdienst von Jerusalem (vom 5. bis 8. Jahrhundert)* (Wiener Beiträge zur Theologie 28, Vienna 1970) 21.

CHAPTER I

THE DIPTYCHS: THEIR NATURE, NAME, AND PURPOSE

In the nomenclature of liturgiology, "diptychs" has long been an accepted technical term. To know the name is not to know the thing, however, and there remains considerable confusion as to just what the diptychs were, where they came from, and how they were distinguished from other types of intercessions for the living and the dead. Prior to beginning our discussion of Byzantine liturgical diptychs, therefore, it is necessary to determine what it is we are talking about.

A. DIPTYCHS, INTERCESSIONS, ACCLAMATIONS

As will become clear in the course of this study, by "liturgical diptychs" I mean the *liturgical unit* thus commonly referred to, not a material object such as the ordinary writing tablets of that name in Antiquity,[1] nor *objects d'art* such as "consular" and other non-liturgical diptychs.[2] Of course liturgical diptychs preserved on papyri, tablets, or in whatever form, are also material objects, and in some cases *objects d'art*, but that aspect is of no concern to us here.

Even with that source of confusion dissipated, and our focus nar-

[1] See McCormick 48 and note 7.

[2] On which, in addition to Stegmüller, Gori, Leclercq, see G. Ph. Negelinus, *De vetusto quodam diptycho consulari et ecclesiastico* (Altdorf 1742); R. Delbrueck, *Die Consulardiptychen und verwandte Denkmäler* (Studien zur spätantiken Kunstgeschichte 2, Berlin/Leipzig 1929); J. Sansterre, "Où le diptyque consulaire de Clementinus fut-il remployé à une fin liturgique?" *Byzantion* 54 (1984) 641-7; W.F. Volbach, *Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters*, 3rd ed. (Mainz 1976); M. Dykmans, "Les obituaires romains. Une définition suivie d'une vue d'ensemble," *Studi medievali* series 3, 19 (1978) 591-652 (esp. 644 and the bibliography in 594 note 7).

rowed to *liturgical* diptychs, there is still need for more precision as to just what that means. For some authors use the term "diptychs" loosely for almost any type of liturgical intercessory prayer containing a list of names of those to be commemorated at the liturgy. The risk of confusion is especially high in the Byzantine eucharistic liturgy, which has six distinct categories of intercessions/commemorations, all of which can involve names. I shall list them in the order in which they occur in the déroulement of the celebration:

1. The commemorative particles at the prothesis or rite of preparation of the gifts before the liturgy, which develop from the eleventh century.[3]
2. The Great Synapte or opening litany of the enarxis, actually the original Litany of the Faithful that once followed the lections and dismissals, found in its present position at the beginning of the liturgy only from the end of the eleventh century.[4]
3. The φήμη/εὐφήμησις/μακαρισμοί/πολυχρόνιον/ἡ τῶν βασιλικῶν ὀνόματων εὐφημία, or acclamations of the sovereigns that were a standard part of Byzantine imperial ritual.[5] To εὐφημίζειν or πολυχρονίζειν, called the latter because of the repetition of the Byzantine equivalents of *Ad multos annos!* – εἰς πολλοὺς χρόνους/πολλοὶ ὑμῖν χρόνοι/εἰς πολλὰ ἔτι/πολλὸ τὰ ἔτι, etc. – was a favorite Byzantine pastime, both civil and religious, for such cheers occurred also during church festivals and services. [6]

[3] The earliest certain Byzantine liturgical witness is the ancient redaction of Georgian CHR in the 11th c. codex *Sinai Georg. 89*, JACOB, "Version géorgienne," 86. Cf. also 9th c. JAS of codex *Vat. Gr. 2282*, PO 26.2:212. On the development of this rite, see DESCOEUDRES 85-126, esp. 103-11, 123-4; cf. also HANSSENS II, 187ff.

[4] On this evolution see TAFT, "How Liturgies Grow," BEW 172.

[5] The latest study of such phenomena is M. MCCORMICK, *Eternal Victory. Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium, and the Early Medieval West* (Cambridge/Paris 1986)

[6] On acclamations, Byzantine and other, and imperial ceremonial in general, see H.J.W. TILLYARD, "The Acclamations of Emperors in Byzantine Ritual," *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 18 (1911-12) 239-60, which gives the text and music from codex *Pantocrator 214N* (AD 1433); also P. MAAS, "Metrische Akklamationen der Byzantiner," BZ 21 (1912) 28-51; F. CABROL, "Acclamations," DACL 1.1:240-65, esp. 243-4; T. KLAUSER, "Akklamationen," RAC 1:216-33; J. SCHMIDT, "Acclamatio," PAULY-WISSOWA 1:147-50; Ieromonax IOANN, *Obrjadnik visantijskago dvora (De ceremoniis aulae Byzantinae) kak cer-*

Among the medieval imperial ceremonial books, the *Κλητορολόγιον* of Philotheus (AD 899),[7] the *De ceremoniis* of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus († 958), and the *De officiis* of Pseudo-Codinus, (ca. 1350-1360), especially the latter two, are full of such polychronia or euphemia,[8] though just how accurately

kovno-arxeologičeskij istočnik (Moscow 1895); A. HEISENBERG, *Aus der Geschichte und Literatur der Palaiogenzeit* (Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-philol. u. hist. Klasse 1920, 10. Abhandlung, Munich 1920) 55ff, 64, 88ff, 108; C. SCHNEIDER, "Das Fortleben der Gesamtantike in den griechischen Liturgien," *Kyrios* 4 (1939) 185-221; E.H. KANTOROWICZ, *Laudes Regiae. A Study in Liturgical Acclamations and Medieval Ruler Worship*. With a Study of the Music of the Laudes and Musical Transcriptions by M.F. BUHOFZER (Berkeley CA 1958); E. PETERSON, *ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ*. Epigraphische, formgeschichtliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Heft 41. - neue Folge, Heft 24. Göttingen 1926) 148-83, esp. 167-8; B. OPFERMANN, *Die liturgischer Herrscherakklamationen im Sacrum Imperium des Mittelalters* (Weimar 1953); O. TREITINGER, *Die oströmische Kaiser- und Reichsidee nach ihrer Gestaltung im höfischen Zeremoniell* (2nd ed. Darmstadt 1956) esp. 49-84; R. TAFT, "The Dialogue before the Anaphora in the Byzantine Eucharistic Liturgy, III: 'Let us give thanks to the Lord – It is fitting and right'," OCP 55 (1989) 69-73; CH. WALTER, "Raising on a Shield in Byzantine Iconography," REB 33 (1975) 133-75 + 7 plates; and the excellent recent studies of imperial ceremonial by M. MCCORMICK, "Analyzing Imperial Ceremonies," *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 35 (1985) 1-20; and ID., *Eternal Victory* (note 5 above) cf. "acclamations" in the index, 419; also S. G. MACCORMACK, *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 1981) "acclamations" in the index, 407; D. CANNADINE and S. PRICE (eds.), *Rituals of Royalty. Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies* (Cambridge 1987).

[7] N. OIKONOMIDES (ed.), *Les listes de préséance byzantines des IXe et Xe siècles* (Paris 1972) 65-235.

[8] *De ceremoniis*: ed. VOGT, texte I-II *passim*, cf. commentaire II, 145-6, 177-97; for acclamations before the liturgy see Book I, chapters 1, 9, 10, 32 (23), 35 (26), 44 (35), VOGT, texte I, 6-12, 54-9, 119-23, 133-5, 169-71; *De officiis*: ed. VERPEAUX 133, 190-1, 193, 197, 203-4, 207-12, 218, 227, 235-7, 241, 246, 269, 274-5, 279-80, 355, 357-8, 360. See also the polychronia in MICHAEL CERULARIUS (1043-1058), *Homily on the Sunday of Orthodoxy*, PG 120: 728-36, and in the appendix to I. HABERT, *APXIERATIKON. Liber Pontificalis Ecclesiae Graecae* (Paris 1676). On acclamations in the *De ceremoniis*, see MACCORMACK, *Art and Ceremony* (note 6 above), 168, 243-6; on acclamations in Byzantine court life in general, see esp. CABROL, HEISENBERG, MAAS, TILLYARD cited in note 6.

these ceremonials mirror actual practice at the time they were compiled is moot.[9]

At the eucharist, the acclamations were proclaimed just before the Trisagion – i.e. at what was once the beginning of the liturgy, right after the introit,[10] when the emperor entered the basilica with the patriarch for the liturgy.[11] So these liturgical acclamations or φήμη (Slavonic: *velikaja poxvala*) are an element of imperial ritual that entered the liturgy first to acclaim the sovereigns, were later accorded also the patriarch or bishop, and were ultimately reduced to a fragment, except in pontifical usage. The text itself, still found through the end of the eighteenth century in the text of the Russian *činovnik*,[12] and in late Greek ms sources,[13] is not included in the printed liturgical books today. Practice varies according to local custom. I have observed at least two different usages at hierarchical liturgies

[9] See A. CAMERON, "The Construction of Court Ritual: The Byzantine *Book of Ceremonies*," in CANNADINE-PRICE, *Rituals of Royalty* (note 6 above) 106-36; C. MANGO, "Daily Life in Byzantium," *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 31.1 (1981) 352-3.

[10] See TAFT, "How Liturgies Grow," BEW 176-7.

[11] See the archieratikon or pontifical diataxis of Demetrius Gemistos (ca. 1380) in codex *Jerusalem Sabas 607 (372)*, DMITR II, 305-6 and apparatus, and that in the 15th c. Athos *St. Andrew Skete Codex* , DMITR I, 169; the diataxis of Theodore Agallianos (AD 1437), M. CHRISTOPOULOS, "Τυπικὰ διάταξις τῆς βασιλείου τάξεως τῇ κυριακῇ τῆς σταυροπροσκυνήσεως," *Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 11 (1935) 50; the 1652 patriarchal Christmas liturgy at Constantinople described by Archdeacon Paul of Aleppo in his *Voyage* I, 2:12, ed. B. RADU, *Voyage du patriarche Macaire d'Antioche. Texte arabe et traduction française*, PO 22.1:126-7; the *čin (ordo)* of the Greek patriarchal liturgy in the *Proskinitarij (The Worshipper)* of the Russian Starec Arsenij Suxanov, an account of his "liturgical pilgrimage" to the East in 1649-1653, IVANOVSKIJ 262-3; the 1683 description of the Slavonic pontifical liturgy incorporated into the 18th c. *Činovnik of Cholmogory* 17. On these sources see TAFT, "Pontifical Liturgy" II, 91-5 (nos. 12, 15, 18, 24, 31) 97; ID., *Great Entrance* XXXVII-VIII; MATEOS, *Célébration* 122-3. Some of these documents will be examined in greater detail in the coming chapters.

[12] *Čin arxierejskago dejstva* f. 10r; *Dejanija* ff. 47v-48r; *Činovnik* (Moscow 1798) ff. 16r-17v. They are not included in the 1944 Warsaw *Činovnik* (f. 5r-v).

[13] See the archieratikon of Gemistos, DMITR II, 306 apparatus 2, and the Athens codices *Ethnike Bibl. 754* (17th c.) and *860* (18th c.), TREMPELAS 39, apparatus.

even within the Patriarchate of Constantinople. In the simplest form of the acclamations, the deacon came to the Royal Doors of the iconostasis after the troparia and Trisagion, just before the prokeimenon preceding the epistle lection, and, facing the congregation with his orarion held aloft in the usual manner, exclaimed, Κύριε σῶσον τοὺς εὐσεβεῖς[14] καὶ ἐπάκουσον ἡμῶν, which the choir or people repeated. In the Patriarchal Cathedral of St. George in Istanbul, however, I have observed the φήμη as they are found in the Slavonic sources of the pontifical.[15] Before the Trisagion the deacon and choir alternate Κύριε σῶσον τοὺς εὐσεβεῖς several times, with καὶ ἐπάκουσον ἡμῶν only at the end. Then the deacon proclaims the φήμη for the patriarch (who was present at the liturgy in question, though not celebrating), and the doxology of the Trisagion Prayer follows. According to the archieratikon of Gemistos, the acclamations *follow* the Trisagion only if there are to be ordinations at the liturgy.[16] That variant practice is probably the source of the confusion in present usage. The Slavonic *Služebnik* and Romanian *Liturghier* give the text of this opening acclamation even for the presbyteral liturgy, though it is usually omitted in practice. It is also misplaced: the deacon interrupts the ekphonesis of the Trisagion Prayer with the exclamation, *Gospodi, spasi blagočestivyja, i uslyši ny!*, which the choir or congregation repeats, and then the deacon concludes the doxology of the prayer, "*i vo veki vekov!*"

4. The litanies of the traditional *preces* following the lections.[17]
5. The medieval commemorations that interrupt the Cherubicon during the Great Entrance or transfer of gifts. They have often been mistaken for the diptychs because of their position in the preanaphora where the diptychs are, in fact, located in some traditions.[18] But as I have shown elsewhere, these Byzantine

[14] Or βασιλεῖς in earlier texts, for the emperor.

[15] *Čin arxierejskago dejstva* ff. 9v-10v; *Činovnik of Cholmogory* 16-17; *Činovnik* (Moscow 1798) ff. 16v-17v.

[16] Dmitr II, 306 apparatus 2.

[17] See note 4 above.

[18] See chapter II, sections A.II, B.V.1-2, and B.VII; chapter III, section C.I.2.

commemorations do not antedate the twelfth-thirteenth centuries, and have nothing to do with the diptychs.[19]

6. The diptychs properly so-called, which alone will concern us here: lists of names and categories of persons to be commemorated, proclaimed by the deacon concomitantly with the commemorations/intercessions of the anaphora.

That there should be a certain similarity in the order and text of these several commemorations will come as no surprise to anyone familiar with the history of liturgical texts.[20] From a glance at the apparatus of the text of the Byzantine diptychs of the living in the *Excursus* following chapter V it is obvious, for instance, that earlier Byzantine intercessory formulas have influenced the text of these diptychs.

But for terminological clarity, as well as in the interests of historical and liturgical accuracy, it is preferable in liturgical nomenclature to reserve the term "diptychs" to the only liturgical unit to which the name τὰ δίπτυχα is ever applied in Greek texts, be they literary, historical, canonical, or liturgical: the names and categories of persons proclaimed by the deacon for remembrance either before the anaphora, as in some traditions,[21] or during it, following the institution narrative and epiclesis in the case of Antiochene-type anaphoras such as BAS and CHR,[22] JAS,[23] EgBAS,[24] GREG,[25] the Armenian [26] and Jacobite traditions,[27] etc., or before the Sanctus, as in Alexandrian-type anaphoras like MK[28] and the Ethiopian Qeddase of the Apostles.[29]

These liturgical diptychs contain all sorts of categories of persons and names – saints, bishops, rulers, clergy, widows, orphans, whatever – but not always the same categories of persons even in any one tradi-

[19] TAFT, *Great Entrance* 227-34.

[20] This is stressed by A.V. PETROVSKIJ, "Drevnij akt prinošenija veščestva dlja tainstva evxaristija i posledovanie proskomidii," *Xristianskoe čtenie* 84 (March 1904) 406-431.

[21] See note 18 above.

[22] LEW 331, 336, 388-9; PE 238, 240.

[23] PO 26.2:212.17; LEW 56.

[24] DORESSE-LANNE 22-9; PE 356.

[25] GERHARDS 46, 48; PE 372.

[26] LEW 440-3; PE 324-6.

[27] LEW 89-95.

[28] CUMING 30; PE 106.

[29] LEW 228.24-229.7.

tion. Since the only shared characteristic of these persons is the fact that they are all either living or dead, the only rational division of the liturgical diptychs, to which, consequently, I shall adhere, is also the only one found in the liturgical sources themselves: diptychs of the living – τὰ δίπτυχα τῶν ζώντων; diptychs of the dead – τὰ δίπτυχα τῶν κεκοιμημένων.

B. NOMENCLATURE

Ὁ δίπτυχος, literally "twofold, double, doubled," is a writing tablet. In Christian Greek the plural, τὰ δίπτυχα, came to mean the tablets on which the names of the living and dead to be commemorated and prayed for in a special way at the eucharist were recorded. Though several terms were used for this liturgical unit in the Greek of Late Antiquity – ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ διθύροι, εὐχαί, κατάλογος/καταλόγοι,[30] δέλτοι,[31] πτύχα (plates, folds, leaves)[32] – the more common name was τὰ δίπτυχα, found, among others, in the earlier sources, and used almost exclusively in later writings and in Byzantine liturgical mss for these lists, as well as for the diaconal proclamation of them at solemn eucharists.[33] I would

[30] NICEPHORUS CALLISTUS, HE (ca. 1320) XIV, 25-27, PG 146:1137B, 1144B.

[31] *Ibid.* XIV, 26-27, PG 146:1140B, 1144A; EVAGRIUS SCHOLASTICUS, HE (ca. 594) III, 20, 34; IV, 38, BIDEZ-PARMENTIER 117, 134, 188 = PG 86.2:2637C, 2673B, 2776B.

[32] PS.-DIONYSIUS, EH III, 2 and 3:8-9, PG 3:426C, 437AB.

[33] THEODORE LECTOR (ca. 528), HE, *Fragment* 27b and *Epitome* 495, GCS 52:120.8-9, 140:18-20; NICEPHORUS CALLISTUS, HE XIV, 26, PG 146:1141AC; MAXIMUS CONFESSOR († 662) [or JOHN SCHOLASTICUS, bishop of Scythopolis in Palestine (536-550)], *Scholia in Ps.-Dionysius*, PG 4:136D, 145A. On which of the *Scholia* to attribute to John, which to Maximus, I generally follow the more conservative position of VON BALTHASAR, "Dionysius-Scholien," here p. 654. P. SHERWOOD, *An Annotated Date-list of the Works of Maximus the Confessor* (Studia Anselmiana 30, Rome 1952) does not attribute any of them to Maximus. In the case of these texts, however, I am inclined for liturgical reasons to attribute them to Maximus (see chapter VI, section B.II, below); MAXIMUS CONFESSOR, *Relatio motionis* 1, 13, PG 90:127B (SHERWOOD, p. 56, dates this source to May 655; on this and other sources of Maximus' trial, see R. DEVREESSE, "La vie de S. Maxime le Confesseur et ses recensions," AB 46 [1928] 5-49, here esp. 26-34); *Vita* 17 of Patriarch Euthymius I of Constantinople (907-912), KARLIN-HAYTER 113 (the *Vita* was written ca. 920-925: *ibid.* 100); Patriarch MICHAEL I

almost be tempted to call it the proper name or "technical term" for this liturgical unit had experience with Byzantine texts not long ago convinced me that the Byzantines were not especially enamored of a single, uniform, set technical terminology, long persisting in their preference for a variety of terms to designate the same reality even if they ultimately came to settle on one more than another.

The verb commonly used to make mention of someone in the diptychs was ἀναφέρω,[34] in the earlier sense of refer to, call to mind.[35] The substantive form, ἡ ἀναφορὰ (reference, report, petition[36]) τοῦ ὀνόματος, would eventually become the usual term for naming in the diptychs.[37]

CERULARIUS (1043-1058), *Letter to Peter of Antioch* 9, PG 120:778C, and Peter's answer, 2, 4-5, *ibid.* 796C, 797C, 800A; Patriarch CALLISTUS I (1350-1353, 1355-1363), response to the monks of Tirnovo in Bulgaria ca. 1361/2, MM I, 437-8 = Reg 2442, cf. 2384.

[34] MAXIMUS, *Relatio motionis* I, 13 and II, 17, PG 90:127B, 145C; MICHAEL I CERULARIUS, *Letter to Peter of Antioch* 9, PG 120:788C, and Peter's reply 2, 5, *ibid.* 796C, 800A; Patriarch JOHN IX AGAPETUS (1111-1134), *Hypomena* of August 1133, SAKKELION 320 = Reg 1005; *Jus canonicum Graeco-Romanum* 26; Patriarch GEORGE II XYPHILINUS (1191-1198), PG 119:888B/D = Reg 1185; cf. VAN DE PAVERD, *Meßliturgie* 517-18; NICEPHORUS CALLISTUS, HE XIV, 25, PG 146:1137C; Patriarch ATHANASIUS I (1289-1293, 1300-1309), *Letter* 69, TALBOT 172.2; CALLISTUS I (ca. 1361/2), *loc. cit.* previous note; the 14-15th c. diataxis in codex *Vatican Gr. 573*, KM 111. But other verbs are found too: ὀναμάζω is frequent; ca. 920-925 the *Vita 17* of Patriarch Euthymius I has ἐκφονέω (KARLIN-HAYTER 113); and in the mss I have found: ἀναγινώσκω in 13-14th c. *Moscow Synod. Gr. 381 (275)*, KM 27; λαμβάνω in 15th c. *Ambros. 637 (P 112 sup.)* f. 18r; and, frequently, λέγω. It is probably ἀναφέρω or λαμβάνω which is behind the Latin "afferat" of the 12th c. *Paris Nouv. Acq. lat. 1791*: "*Diaconus tacite tabulas mortuorum afferat*," though S's Greek retroversion ignores it (STRITTMATTER, "Missa Graecorum," 124-5).

[35] LIDDELL-SCOTT 125.

[36] *Loc. cit.*

[37] MAXIMUS, *Relatio motionis* II, 17, PG 90:145C; the synodal decision of Sept. 1089 concerning Pope Urban II in the diptychs, HOLTZMANN 60-2; PETER OF ANTIOCH (1052-1056), *Letter to Michael Cerularius* 4-5, PG 120:797C, 800B; patriarchs: JOHN IX AGAPETUS (1111-1134), *Hypomena* to the stauropegic Monastery of Patmos in August of 1133, confirming the independence of the monastery and requiring "only the anaphora of the [patriarch's] name" in the liturgy, SAKKELION 320 = Reg 1005; GERMANUS II (1223-1240), *Tomos*, MM I, 438.31 = Reg 1285; ID., *Jus canonicum Graeco-Romanum* 2, PG 119:804B/D; MANUEL II (1244-1255) 3, *ibid.* 817AB (cf. VAN DE PAVERD, *Meßliturgie* 518); CALLISTUS I (ca. 1361/2), *loc. cit.* note 34. Cf. Reg 791, 796, 835.9, 837, 953, 1005, 1049,

though one also finds other terms, like πρόσρησις, προσηγορία, ἀννάρησις.[38]

C. PRESENT BYZANTINE LITURGICAL USAGE

Since Byzantine usage, unlike most other traditions, places the diptychs and commemorations of the dead before those of the living, that is the order I shall follow here. The practice described is exactly the same for either eucharistic formulary, CHR or BAS.

I. The Diptychs of the Dead

The Byzantine diptychs of the dead have fallen into disuse except for a remnant and a rubric in today's editions.

1. *The Presider's Ekphonesis*

The remnant is the ekphonesis or exclamation of the presiding priest in commemoration of Mary Theotokos, which once opened the

1185, and *Index analytique*, Liturgie 7: "Anaphore." JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, *In Acta apost. hom. 18*, 5, PG 60:148, could be interpreted in the same sense. See also Charles du Fresne DU CANGE, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae graecitatis* (Lyons 1688/Graz 1958) s.v. ἀναφορά. Anaphora was also the term used for the report to the patriarch on the results of the episcopal elections in suffragan sees, an issue intimately related to the diptychal anaphora such suffragans owed the patriarch, and significant in the rise of Constantinopolitan patriarchal hegemony, as has recently been shown in the excellent study of P. KARLTIN-HAYTER, "Activity of the Bishop of Constantinople outside his *Paroikia* between 381 and 451," in *ΚΑΘΗΓΗΤΡΙΑ. Essays Presented to Joan Hussey for her 80th Birthday* (Camberley, Surrey 1988) 179-210, here 208-9.

[38] THEODORET OF CYRRHUS (ca. 393-466), EH V, 34:12, GCS 44:337; NICEPHORUS CALLISTUS, HE XIV, 25, 27, PG 146:1137B, 1144B, 1145C; PS.-DIONYSIUS, EH III, 2, PG 3:425C.

Byzantine diptychs of the departed in the liturgy of the Great Church. Its textus receptus in the 1962 Athens Hieratikon[39] reads as follows:

> **Ὁ Ἱερεύς, θυμιῶν τὴν ἁγίαν Τράπεζαν κατέμπροσθεν, λέγει ἐκφώνως·** Ἐξαιρέτως τῆς Παναγίας, ἀχράντου, ὑπερευλογημένης, ἐνδόξου, Δεσποίνης ἡμῶν θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας.

2. *The Diaconal Diptychs*

This presider's exclamation was once followed immediately by the diptychs of the dead, proclaimed aloud by the deacon. This custom has long since fallen into disuse, but a reminder of earlier usage can be discerned in the rubric instructing the deacon to remember the departed in silence as he incenses around the altar. Its text from the same 1962 Athens Hieratikon reads:

> **Καὶ ἐπιδίδωσι τὸ θυμιατήριον τῷ Διακόνῳ, ὅστις θυμιῶν κύκλῳ τὴν ἁγίαν Τράπεζαν, μνεμονεύει, καθ'ἑαυτὸν ὧν ἂν βούλεται, ζώντων τε καὶ τεθνεώτων.**

In Greek monasteries, at least, it is still customary for the deacon to do this *sotto voce*, but audibly. In the meantime, the choir sings the Ἄξιον ἐστιν refrain in honor of the Theotokos.

This incensation, today considered an honor to the Theotokos, since the diptychs are no longer proclaimed, is rather to be interpreted as a remembrance of the dead, in line with the still current Byzantine liturgical custom of incensing during prayers for the dead. The use of incense in connection with the dead derives from pre-Christian secular usage, when incense was employed at funerals for obvious reasons.[40]

[39] Apostolike Diakonia 1962, 136, 186. Cf. LEW 330-1, 388.

[40] On the liturgical uses of incense, see TAFT, *Great Entrance* 149-51. To the references there, one can add a text among the dubia attributed to Chorbishop BALAI († *post* 432) from near Beroea (Aleppo), which speaks of the dead "benefitting from vigils, eucharist, and the thurible of expiation, when the priest commemorates their name before the altar": J.J. OVERBECK, ed., *S. Ephraemi syri, Rabulae episcopi Edesseni, Balaei aliorumque opera selecta* (Oxford 1865) 333:5-14. On Balai and his works, see URBINA 91-3 (p. 92 for the work in question). A German trans. of the text is found in P.S. LANDERSDORFER, *Ausgewählte Schriften der syrischen Dichter Cyrillonas, Baläus, Isaak von Antiochien und Jakob von Sarug* (BKV 6, Kempten/Munich 1913) 99.

II. The Diptychs of the Living

The diptychs of the living manifest the exact same structure: presider's incipit followed by diaconal lists. Here is the text in the editio princeps of Demetrius Doukas, Rome 1526, in both CHR (f. 15v) and BAS (f. 27v):

> **Ὁ μὲν διάκονος ἐπιστρέφει πρὸς τὴν θύραν τοῦ ἁγίου βήματος κρατῶν τὸ ὡράριον τοῖς τρισὶν ἄκροις δακτύλοις, καὶ λέγει·** Καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.
>
> **Ὁ δὲ χορὸς ψάλλει·** Καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.
>
> **Ὁ δὲ ἱερεὺς ἐκφωνεῖ·** Ἐν πρώτοις μνήσθητι Κύριε τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου ἡμῶν **ὁ δεῖνος**, ὃν χάρισαι ταῖς ἁγίαις σου ἐκκλησίαις ἐν εἰρήνῃ σῷον ἔντιμον ὑγιᾶ μακροημερεύοντα, καὶ ὀρθοτομοῦντα τὸν λόγον τῆς σῆς ἀληθείας.
>
> **Καὶ ὁ διάκονος πρὸς τῇ θύρα στάς, λέγει·** Τοῦ **ὁ δεῖνος** πανιερωστάτου **μητροπολίτου, ἢ ἐπισκόπου, ὅστις ἂν ᾖ.** Καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ προσκομίζοντος τὰ ἅγια δῶρα ταῦτα εὐλαβεστάτου ἱερέως **ὁ δεῖνος.** Ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ θεοφιλάκτων βασιλέων ἡμῶν, καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.
>
> **Ὁ χο(ρός)·** Καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.[41]

1. *The Presider's Ekphonesis*

The original incipit of the diptychs of the living is still in use in the presiding celebrant's ekphonesis commemorating his immediate hierarchical superior: bishop or archbishop in the case of a presbyter, metropolitan or patriarch in the case of an eparchial bishop; at least the four Eastern Orthodox patriarchs of the pentarchy in the case of the ruling hierarch of an autonomous or autocephalous but non-patriarchal Orthodox Church, and, finally, if the celebrant is himself a patriarch, the other patriarchs, at least of the pentarchy, with whom he is in communion.

The textus receptus, the same for both BAS and CHR formularies, reads as follows:

> **Ἐκφώνως·** Ἐν πρώτοις, μνήσθητι, Κύριε τοῦ Ἀρχιεπισκόπου **(ἢ Ἐπισκόπου)** ἡμῶν **(δεῖνος)**, ὃν χάρισαι ταῖς ἁγίαις σου Ἐκκλησίαις ἐν εἰρήνῃ, σῷον, ἔντιμον, ὑγιᾶ, μακροημερεύοντα, καὶ ὀρθοτομοῦντα τὸν λόγον τῆς σῆς ἀληθείας.[42]

[41] GOAR 63 gives the same text from the Venice 1638 euchology.

[42] Hieratikon (Athens 1962) 137, 188. Cf. LEW 336, 389.

A rubric in the 1951 Athens Hieratikon[43] renders the usage explicit:

> Ἐν πρώτοις... Ἀρχιεπισκόπου ἡμῶν **(καὶ ἀπαγγέλλει τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κατὰ τόπον κανονικοῦ Ἐπισκόπου, εἴτε Ἐπισκοπός ἐστιν οὗτος, εἴτε Μητροπολίτης, εἴτε Πατριάρχης, ἢ τοῦ χοροστατοῦντος τυχὸν ἀρχιερέως)**...

Other editions, both Catholic and Orthodox, especially editions not of the Greek Orthodox Church, express a more pyramidal view of the Church, commemorating not only the presider's immediate superior but also the patriarch or ruling synod.[44] I shall return to this point later, in chapter V, section B.I.1.

2. *The Diaconal Diptychs*

To this incipit of the Byzantine diptychs of the living, some, though by no means all, modern editions of the liturgy append, and sometimes even prefix, a diaconal exclamation that originally was the finale of both diptychal lists, of the dead (the exclamation before the Ἐν πρώτοις ekphnonesis) as well as of the living (the one after the Ἐν πρώτοις ekphonesis).[45]

In short, today's texts give at most the beginning and end of the pristine diptychs according to the usage of the Great Church. The textus receptus of this diaconal exclamation, the same for both BAS and CHR formularies, reads as follows in the 1962 Athens Hieratikon:

> **Ὁ Διάκονος ἐκφωνεῖ**· Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος κατὰ διάνοιαν ἔχει, καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.

Other editions are more explicit, following the celebrant's diptychal ekphonesis with a rubric – in actual usage generally ignored – for the deacon to proclaim the diptychs of the living, and providing a longer fragment of the latter:

[43] Also an Apostolike Diakonia edition, 90.

[44] Catholic editions: *Hieratikon* (Rome 1950) 137, 200; *Služebnik* (vulgate, i.e. Muscovite, recension, Rome 1956) 265, 381; *Liturgikon siest' Služebnik* (Ruthenian recension, Rome 1942) 255-6, 374. Orthodox editions: *Služebnik* (Belgrade 1928) 153; *Služebnik* (St. Petersburg 1900) 153; *The Divine Liturgy according to St. John Chrysostom, with Appendices* (recension of The Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America, now the Orthodox Church in America [OCA], New York 1967) 69.

[45] See below, chapter IV, section B.II.2; chapter V, section B.V.

Καὶ ὁ διάκονος πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ στάς λέγει· Τοῦ δεῖνος πατριάρχου, μητροπολίτου ἢ ἐπισκόπου **ὅστις ἂν ᾖ κτλ. εἶτα μνημονεύει ὁ αὐτὸς τὰ δίπτυχα τῶν ζῶντων.**[46]

And some Greek editions of the liturgy still provide an abbreviated formula for the diaconal diptychs even at presbyteral liturgies, as in the 1950 Rome edition of the Hieratikon:

Καὶ ὁ διάκονος, πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ στάς, μνημονεύει τῶν ζώντων· εἶτα δὲ ἐκφωνεῖ: Καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ προσκομίζοντος τὰ ἅγια δῶρα ταῦτα, εὐλαβεστάτου Ἱερέως **τοῦ δεῖνος.** Ὑπὲρ σωτηρὰς τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ θεοφιλάκτων βασιλέων ἡμῶν, σωτηρίας τε καὶ βοηθείας τοῦ περιεσῶτος λαοῦ, καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος κατὰ διάνοιαν ἔχει, καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.

Ὁ χορός: Καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.[47]

I have actually heard such diaconal diptychs proclaimed at presbyteral liturgies only among the Melkites, though this reflects the medieval tradition reported, we shall see, by Leo Tuscan.[48] More usually, at a non-pontifical liturgy, if there is no deacon serving, the diaconal diptychs are omitted entirely. And even if there is a deacon, they are either omitted or reduced to the finale or its conclusion: ⟨Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος κατὰ διάνοιαν ἔχει,⟩ καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.

III. The Diptychs of the Living at the Pontifical Liturgy

Today it is only at more solemn pontifical liturgies that the full diaconal diptychs of the living are proclaimed, and their Greek text, rarely found in the liturgical books, is not easy to come by.

1. *The Medieval Manuscripts*

The earliest extant text of these diakonika, still in their pure form, is found ca. 1166 in the Palestinian diakonikon codex *Sinai Gr. 1040*,[49] and mss continue to report the text through the first half of the fif-

[46] LEW 389.
[47] Pp. 137-38. Similarly, *Euchologion* (Rome 1873) 98.
[48] Chapter V, section B.II.3.
[49] DMITR II, 134.

teenth century. This text with its variants in the ms tradition is cited and discussed below in chapter V and the appended *Excursus*. If we prescind, for the moment, from secondary variants in the mss of these diaconal lists, the full Byzantine diptychs of the living would read as follows:

1. *Deacon*: And for those whom each one has in mind, and for each and all!

2. *People*: And for each and all!

3. *Presider*: First of all remember, Lord, our (arch)bishop N. Preserve him for your holy churches in peace, safe, honorable, healthy, long-lived, (and) rightly handling the word of your truth!

4. *The deacon [proclaims] the diptychs of the living*:

5. [For[50]] N. our most blessed and holy father and ecumenical patriarch of Constantinople; the most holy, pious, orthodox patriarchs N. of Alexandria, N. of Antioch, N. of Jerusalem;

6. N. our most reverend father and (arch)bishop of N.;

7. for the one offering these holy gifts to the Lord our God, the priest N.;

8. for the venerable presbyterate,

9. the diaconate in Christ,

10. and the whole priestly order;

11. for the salvation, authority, victory, and preservation of our most pious and Christ-loving emperors N. and N.;

12. for the peace and tranquillity of the whole world

13. and of all God's holy Orthodox Churches;

14. for the redemption of our brethren in captivity,

15. and for all orthodox Christians suffering tribulation and in need of God's mercy;

16. for the success and supremacy of the Christ-loving army;

17. for the forgiveness and remission of the sins of the people here present,

18. and for those whom each one has in mind, and for each and all!

19. *People*: And for each and all!

As was already noted, in this text the opening diaconal exclamation [1] and the people's response [2], which now seem to be an introduction to the diptychs of the living, are actually the old finale of the now obsolete diptychs of the dead.

[50] Since the Greek text is in the genitive, I presume the verb "remember" or the preposition ὑπέρ, though the latter is never expressed with the names of the patriarchs/hierarchs at the beginning of the diaconal lists, but only later, beginning with no. 7.

2. *A Modern Text from Jersualem*

The laconic and practically rubricless modern Greek pontifical or ἀρχιερατικὸν does not furnish diptychs,[51] but Brightman gives the text of the modern hagiopolite diptychs of the living, for use with CHR/BAS, which were printed on a card, obviously for the deacon to use at the liturgy, at the Patriarchal Press in Jerusalem in 1894.[52] On one side of the card, one finds the following:

ΔΙΠΤΥΧΑ

Γερασίμου τοῦ μακαριωτάτου τε καὶ παναγιωτάτου πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ πατριάρχου τῆς ἁγίας πόλεως Ἱεροσολήμ καὶ πάσης Παλαιστίνης πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη.

Νεοφύτου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, Σωφρονίου Ἀλεξανδρείας, καὶ Σπυρίδωνος Ἀντιοχείας τῶν ἁγιωτάτων εὐσεβῶν καὶ ὀρθοδόξων πατριαρχῶν πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη.

Ὑπὲρ τοῦ προσκομίζοντος τὰ τίμια καὶ ἅγια δῶρα ταῦτα Κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν, τοῦ τιμίου πρεβυτερίου, τῆς ἐν Χριστοῦ διακονίας, παντὸς ἱερατικοῦ τάγματος καὶ μοναχικοῦ σχήματος καὶ τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν.

Ὑπὲρ εἰρήνης καὶ ἀγαθῆς καταστάσεως τοῦ σύμπαντος κόσμου, εὐσταθείας τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησιῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν πάντων ἑνώσεως.

Ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ θεοφυλάκτων βασιλέων καὶ αὐθεντῶν ἡμῶν, παντὸς τοῦ παλατίου καὶ τοῦ στρατοπέδου αὐτῶν.

Ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας καὶ ἀντιλήψεως πάντων τῶν εὐσεβῶν καὶ ὀρθοδόξων χριστιανῶν, προσκυνητῶν ἐπιτρόπων τε καὶ συνδρομητῶν τοῦ παναγίου καὶ ζωοδόχου τάφου, ἐπισκέψεως τε καὶ βοηθείας παντὸς τοῦ περιεστῶτος χριστεπωνύμου λαοῦ,

Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος κατὰ διάνοιαν ἔχει καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.

On the verso side of the card there is this series of additional commemorations to be used on the feast days of the respective Orthodox sovereigns of Russia and Greece:

Τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου αὐτοκράτορος πασῶν τῶν Ῥωσσιῶν Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρίδου,

Τῆς εὐσεβεστάτης συζύγου αὐτοῦ αὐτοκρατείρας Μαρίας τῆς θεοδωρίδος,

Τοῦ εὐσεβοῦς διαδόχου αὐτῶν Νικολάου τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρίδου καὶ παντὸς τοῦ αὐτοκρατορικοῦ οἴκου καὶ τοῦ στρατοπέδου αὐτῶν.

Τοῦ θεοσεβεστάτου βασιλέως τῶν Ἑλλήνων Γεωργίου τοῦ α',

[51] Cf. the editio princeps, Venice: Antonio Bartoli (1714) 8-9, 22, 24; the ed. of Constantinople (1820) 7-8, 19-20; and of Athens (1902) 9-10, 23-4.

[52] LEW 503.

Τῆς εὐσεβεστάτης συζύγου αὐτοῦ Βασιλίσσης Ὄλγας,
Τοῦ εὐσεβοῦς διαδόχου αὐτῶν Κωνσταντίνου καὶ τῶν εὐσεβῶν βασιλοπαίδων, παντὸς τοῦ βασιλικοῦ οἴκου καὶ τοῦ στρατοπέδου αὐτῶν.

One can see from the πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη finale that these diptychs have been contaminated by confusion with the φῆμη or introit acclamations discussed at the beginning of this chapter, a contamination noted as early as the twelfth century in the version of Leo Tuscan, and betrayed by the misuse in Slavonic of such terms as *fimi* (φῆμη) or *velikaja pox-vala*, "The Great Praise," for the diptychs[53]: acclamations are praises; diptychs are commemorative petitions. So such names belong to the acclamations, whereas in Slavonic the diptychs are more properly called *pomjanik*, as in the rubric for the diptychs of the dead in Slavonic BAS of the fifteenth-century codex *Vatican Slav. 14*, f. 44v: "The deacon reads the diptychs (*pomenik*) of the dead."[54]

3. *Present Usage*

a. The Patriarchal Liturgy:

Such full diptychs with the pentarchial commemorations are rarely heard today. In the Patriarchate of Constantinople the diptychs are proclaimed only when the patriarch himself is celebrating, officials there have informed me, and the rubrics of the 1798 Moscow *Činovnik* (f. 50r) decree the same usage: only when the President of the Holy Synod, at that time chief hierarch of the Russian Orthodox Church, was presiding, did the deacon commemorate, after the Holy Governing Synod, the patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem "*ašče že vosxoščet predsedatel'* – if the President [of the Holy Synod] wishes" (f. 50r). And, indeed, I have attended Sunday liturgy in the patriarchal cathedral of St. George in Istanbul, celebrated by one of the metropolitans, with the patriarch in attendance, at which the presider commemorated the patriarch at the Ἐν πρώτοις, but no diaconal diptychs were proclaimed.

[53] See below, chapter V, sections B.II.3 and B.III.3-6.

[54] Cf. Orlov 223 apparatus (*pomnik*); Huculak 319. The more common modern Russian term is *vykličка*, though earlier one finds also *sinodik*, a misnomer, for the synodikon is not a diptych (on the synodikon see the study of Gouillard cited below in chapter VI, note 24).

b. The Episcopal Liturgy:

When the diptychs are used at hierarchical liturgies presided over by a bishop other than the patriarch or chief hierarch of an independent Orthodox Church such as the Archbishop of Sinai (as in the diptychs cited above from *Sinai Gr. 1040*), Athens, Cyprus, etc., the following procedure is customary. The presiding celebrant commemorates the patriarch or major archbishop at the Ἐν πρώτοις ekphonesis. The next-ranking concelebrating bishop or presbyter to his right then commemorates the presiding celebrant with the same exclamation – but minus the "First of all" incipit, for in this case only the ruling hierarch is remembered "first of all" – thus:

> Μνήσθητι, Κύριε, τοῦ (ἀρχι)ἐπισκόπου ἡμῶν **τοῦ δεῖνος**, ὃν χάρισαι ταῖς ἁγίαις σου ἐκκλησίαις ἐν εἰρήνῃ σῶον ἔντιμον ὑγιᾶ μακροημερεύοντα καὶ ὀρθοτομοῦντα τὸν λόγον τῆς σῆς ἀληθείας.

After this, the deacon proclaims the diaconal lists, naming, however, only the patriarch, the local ordinary, and the concelebrating bishops, commemorating the rest by category.

The 1944 Warsaw *Činovnik* (ff. 13v-14r) gives, in Slavonic, the full modern system in proper form:

> *Protodeacon*: For each and all!
> *People*: For each and all!
> *Bishop*: First of all, remember, Lord, our Lord the most blessed Dionisij, Metropolitan of Warsaw, and the whole Orthodox episcopate. Grant them to your holy churches in peace, safe, honorable, healthy, long-lived, and rightly handling the word of your truth.
> *Also, after the bishop the first archimandrite or protopresbyter says*: Remember, Lord, the most reverend (*name [of the bishop presiding]*), whom grant to your holy Churches in peace, safe, honorable, healthy, long-lived, and rightly handling the word of your truth.
> *And after the ekphonesis the bishop blesses him, and says [in a low voice]*: May the Lord God remember your priesthood (in his kingdom, always, now and forever, and unto ages of ages. Amen!)
> *But the archdeacon or protodeacon, standing in the doors facing the people, says in a loud voice the great acclamation (velikuju poxvalu)*: Our Lord the most blessed Dionisij, Metropolitan of Warsaw; and our Lord the most reverend archbishop or bishop (*name and see*) who is offering these holy gifts to the Lord our God; for the honorable presbyterate and the diaconate in Christ, for the whole priestly and monastic order; for our God-bearing country and its governing authorities; for peace in the whole world, for the well-being of the holy Churches of God; for the deliverance of our brothers who are in prison, captivity, any tribulation; for the salvation of

the people here present, each of whom is mindful of his sins,[55] and for each and all!

People: And for each and for all!

And the archdeacon or protodeacon kisses the bishop's hand.

Within the patriarchate of Constantinople I have observed another usage at a pontifical liturgy presided over by a metropolitan and two concelebrating presbyters. At the Ἐν πρώτοις, the metropolitan commemorated the patriarch, after which each priest in turn chanted the Ἐν πρώτοις for the presider. Then the deacon came to the doors to exclaim not the full diptychs, but only their finale: Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος κατὰ διάνοιαν ἔχει, καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.

The repetition of the presider's ekphonesis by the concelebrants dates to at least the seventeenth century, as we shall see in chapter V, sections B.III.4-6. But to employ the Ἐν πρώτοις incipit with this ekphonesis when commemorating anyone but the patriarch, though that practice is also found in the seventeenth-century sources discussed in chapter V, section B.III, is less suitable than the other custom of using simply the Μνήσθητι Κύριε incipit.

In Russian usage the deacon chants the diptychs of the living only during a pontifical liturgy on more solemn occasions. Since there is no fixed rule determining what those occasions might be, before the liturgy one will here the deacons ask, "*Vykličkа budet* – will there be the diptychs?"

IV. The Exclamation Καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν/*I vsex i vsja*

The Exclamation "For each and everyone," interjected by the deacon both before the presider's introductory ekphonesis of the diptychs of the living, and at the end of the diptychs, and repeated after him by the people as response, is used somewhat differently according to the sources. It is found before the presider's ekphonesis that opens the diptychal lists in many though by no means all sources of the pontifical liturgy, but is usually omitted from the presbyteral service. As I have

[55] This phrase, *i pomyšljajuščix kijždo ix o svoix sogrešenitx*, is an obvious (and unfortunate) corruption of the original Slavonic text: *i imže kijždo v pomysle imeet (Čin arxierejskago dejstva* f. 26v; *Dejanija* f. 57r), translating the original Greek καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος κατὰ διάνοιαν ἔχει.

already noted, although today this appears to be an overture to the presider's Ἐν πρώτοις ekphonesis, it is actually a remainder, the finale of the now defunct diptychs of the dead. And at the end of the diptychs of the living it serves exactly the same purpose.[56]

Contemporary Melkite usage offers a variant. At the end of the diptychs, instead of responding thus to the diaconal Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος κατὰ διάνοιαν ἔχει καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν, in some Melkite churches the people reply in Arabic with a response from praxis, but not found in the liturgical books: "Lord, grant long life to their lordships and preserve all your Christian peoples."[57]

CONCLUSION

From what we have seen, we may summarize the entire liturgical unit of the diptychs in present Byzantine practice as follows.

1. The diptychs of the dead have been reduced to the presider's Marian ekphonesis plus the deacon's private memento of the departed while he incenses around the altar in their memory. Sometimes the deacon concludes this by proclaiming aloud the old finale of the now obsolete lists.
2. The diptychs of the living are proclaimed in full only at pontifical liturgies, and even then but rarely.
3. The diaconal exclamations and diptychs are always omitted if there is no deacon serving.
4. In their most abbreviated form, the diptychs of the living are reduced to the presider's ekphonesis for the hierarchy, to which the people respond, "And for each and all." This much is always done at every liturgy – and never more than this at a liturgy presided over by a single bishop or presbyter, without the assistance of either deacon or concelebrants.
5. To this minimum, other elements of the fullest form may be added at other liturgies with the assistance of a deacon and/or concelebrants above that rank.

[56] See note 45 above.

[57] A. COUTURIER, *Cours de liturgie grecque-melkite* (Jerusalem 1930) III, 169.

This fullest form comprises the following elements:

1. The entire liturgical unit begins and ends with a fixed diaconal proclamation, "And for those whom each one has in mind, *and for each and all,*" to which the people respond by repeating the finale, "And for each and all." As we shall see, the first of these proclamations, which now appears to open the diptychs of the living, is actually the débris – the former finale – of the now obsolete diptychs of the dead. This diaconal introduction and conclusion framing the entire liturgical unit is sometimes reduced to the italicized finale and, at the opening, before the presider's ekphonesis, is sometimes omitted entirely.
2. The presiding celebrant then commemorates "First of all" his immediate episcopal superior.
3. If the presider is a bishop and the liturgy is being concelebrated, the next-ranking concelebrant, bishop or presbyter, then commemorates the presider – ideally, however, not with "First of all, remember Lord...," but only "Remember, Lord...," since there is only one "first of all."
4. Sometimes, though rarely, the other concelebrants will repeat the same ekphonesis.
5. If the presider is a patriarch or ruling archbishop of an autocephalous Church, however, he should not proclaim the "First of all," since in his Church *he* is "first of all." Rather, he should make a general commemoration, "Remember, Lord, the whole Orthodox episcopate rightly directing the word of your truth."
6. In that case, the next-ranking concelebrant would commemorate the presider "first of all."
7. If the Church has a Holy Governing Synod in place of a ruling patriarch or archbishop, as was the case in Russia from 1700-1917, even the chief bishop or president of the synod would commemorate the synod "first of all," since it is the synod, not he, who heads the hierarchy.[58] This situation was abnormal, however, an uncanonical exception imposed on the Russian Orthodox Church by Peter the Great.

[58] *Činovnik* (Moscow 1789) ff. 49r-50v.

8. At the end of these episcopal/presbyteral exclamation(s), the people once again respond with the customary "And for each and all."
9. Then the deacon – the ranking archdeacon or protodeacon if more than one deacon is serving – proclaims the diaconal lists, naming **1)** the ruling hierarchical authority of the autocephalous Church (patriarch, archbishop, Holy Synod); **2)** *at a liturgy at which the latter is the presiding celebrant*, the four Orthodox patriarchs of the pentarchy; **3)** the local ordinary if different from **1**; **4)** the bishop presiding at the service if he is not **1** or **3**; **5)** the concelebrating bishops, if any; and then the rest by category: **6)** the presbyterate, **7)** the diaconate, **8)** the priestly and **9)** monastic orders; **10)** for peace in the world; **11)** for the well-being and unity of the Churches; **12)** for the civil authorities (by name only in the case of monarchs);[59] **13)** for all Orthodox Christians; **14)** for those present at the service; **15)** "and for those whom each one has in mind, and for each and all."
10. At presbyteral eucharists with a deacon serving, the deacon may sometimes proclaim an abbreviated form of the diptychs, mentioning only the presider by name, then including one or more of the final general formulas for different categories – the civil authorities (**12**), by name in the case of royalty, those present at the liturgy (**14**), and everyone (**15**) – or, in most cases, just that finale (**15**).
11. At the end, the people respond with the usual finale, "And for each and all."

[59] There is considerable variety in the sources concerning the placement of the civil authorities. Pre-revolutionary Russian sources (*Čin arxierjskago dejstva* f. 27r; *Dejanija* f. 58r) put them, as one would expect from such an autocracy, right after (**1**), commemorating the whole imperial family and their consorts by name, the whole court and army – and, in some cases, no one else, as in the 1798 Moscow *Činovnik* (f. 49v-50r). The 1944 Warsaw *Činovnik* puts it after (**9**), a position justified by earlier Greek diakonikon mss such as *Sinai Gr. 1040* and other sources cited in chapter V, sections B.II-III.

CHAPTER II

THE BACKGROUND: EASTERN LITURGICAL DIPTYCHS IN THE EARLY SOURCES

If the Byzantine Divine Liturgy is the focus of the present investigation, the demands of comparative liturgy make it imperative to see the Byzantine diptychs in the larger context of early eastern liturgical practice. In this chapter I shall attempt to delineate this background as it emerges in the evidence for the diptychs in eastern traditions other than that of Constantinople. Western evidence, much of it irrelevant to our argument, will be referred to only when useful to clarify aspects of the history of the diptychs common to both East and West.[1] The sources for the rite of the Great Church will be treated separately, in chapters IV, V, VI.

A. THE STATE OF THE QUESTION

I. Preces, Intercessions, Diptychs

In the previous chapter we already noted a certain confusion concerning the nature and origins of the diptychs, and how they are distinguished from other types of intercessions for the living and the dead. This uncertainty is partly the product of diversity in the sources from

[1] Abundant references to western material can be found especially in CABIÉ and in KOEP 100-13. See also other general studies on the diptychs: BISHOP, "Appendix," 97-117, and ID., "Comments" I-IX; STEGMÜLLER; CABROL, "Diptyques;" F.E. BRIGHTMAN, "Chronicle," JTS 12 (1911) 319-23; CONNOLLY, "Innocent I," 215-26; VAN DE PAVERD, "Intercessions," 322-8; MELIA; COZZA-LUZI, "De sacris collybis et diptychis," 138-43; DIX, *Shape* 498-511; J. H. SRAWLEY, *The Early History of the Liturgy* (Cambridge 1949) 202-6. Among the older works, see GORI; BONA 260-71.

the very start. Fourth-century witnesses reveal the existence of two distinct diptychal traditions in the East.

1. Since early liturgy associated the offerers, their offerings, and those for whom they offered, in some areas like Cilicia and Mesopotamia the diptychs were associated not with the *offering of the anaphora itself*, but with the *preanaphoral offering or transfer of gifts*.[2]
2. Elsewhere, the diptychs were concomitant with the intercessions for the living and dead in the anaphora.[3]

Though liturgically they fit equally well in either location, all rites except the East Syrian and Tikritan traditions of Mesopotamia,[4] Maronite *Šarar*,[5] and, in the West, the Gallican and Iberian[6] rites, eventually came to prefer the latter option, locating both diptychs and intercessions within the eucharistic prayer.

How all this began is still subject to dispute, though it is generally agreed that the intercessions in the eucharist were originally confined to the *preces* following the lections at the end of the Liturgy of the Word, and that pristine anaphoras, like that of *ApTrad* 4,[7] had none:

> The intercessory prayers, like the *Sanctus*, did not form part of the earliest structure of the Eucharistic Prayers. Hippolytus does not have them; in the Gallican and Spanish rites the "reading of the names" took place "before the mysteries" and never became part of the Eucharistic Prayer proper. All

[2] See table I, TAFT, *Great Entrance* 48-9.

[3] I am aware of the later distinction between anaphoral *commemorations* of the Mother of God and of the saints, and the *intercessions* for the living and for the ordinary dead. See, for instance, J. HENNIG, "Zu den Namenlisten in den eucharistischen Hochgebeten," EL 86 (1977) 280-9, esp. 281; J.A. JUNGMANN, *The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer* (New York 1965) 264-8; G. WAGNER, "La commémoration des saints dans la prière eucharistique," *Irénikon* 45 (1972) 447-56; MEYER, *Eucharistie* 348. But the validity of this distinction for the earlier period can be challenged (see the comments of WINKLER, "Interzessionen" I, 305-8), and at any rate the issue need not concern us, since it seems clear enough that the commemoration of saints in the anaphora is a result of the intercessions for the dead, not vice-versa, and the latter is the focus of our attention here.

[4] LEW 275-81 and below, chapter III, section C.I.

[5] See chapter III, section C.I.3.

[6] Details and further literature in MEYER, *Eucharistie* 154-61, esp. 152, 159, 161; other references in note 1 above, esp. CABIÉ 40-44.

[7] BOTTE 12-17 = PE 81.

the other liturgical families did have the intercessory prayers but at different places; this would indicate that they were introduced only after the main components of the anaphora had been given their fixed order.[8]

Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.* 5, 9, is one of the first to witness to anaphoral intercessions and to provide them a justification.[9] This is sometimes taken as evidence that such intercessions were a hagiopolite innovation.[10] It is further argued that these anaphoral intercessions originated in the shift to the anaphora of the intercessions or "Prayers of the Faithful" originally located after the lections.[11] Were it not for *ApTrad* 4, however, no one would doubt that intercessions were part of the eastern anaphora from the start. Though Justin's *Apology* I, 65 and 67, does not mention intercessions in its description of the thanksgiving,[12] and Gallican-type anaphoras have none, intercessions are found in the Jewish prayer forms that constitute the putative parentage of the eucharistic anaphora,[13] as well as in all other early anaphoral antecedents and sources:[14] *Didache* 10.5,[15] the *Euchology of Sarapion*,[16] Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.* 5, 8-9,[17] Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Hom.* 16, 14,[18] *ApConst* VIII, 12:40-49,[19] *TestDom* I, 23,[20] the papyri *Strasbourg Gr.* 254 and *John Ry-*

[8] R. CABIÉ, *The Eucharist* = A.G. MARTIMORT, ed., *The Church at Prayer. An Introduction to the Liturgy* II (new ed. Collegeville 1986) 103; cf. SRAWLEY 202-6.

[9] Cited below, section C.II.1.

[10] See DIX, *Shape* 170-2, 509-11, and the views of E.C. Ratcliff summarized in B. SPINKS, "The Cleansed Leper's Thankoffering before the Lord: Edward Craddock Ratcliff and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora," BELS 19: 164-5, 78.

[11] DIX, *Shape* 509-11; SRAWLEY 202-3.

[12] E.J. GOODSPEED (ed.), *Die ältesten Apologeten* (Göttingen 1914) 74-5 = PE 68-70.

[13] PE 10-12.

[14] Most of them conveniently gathered in PE 66, 92-4, 116, 118, 122, 132, 208, 218, 221.

[15] *La Doctrine des douze apôtres (Didachè)*, ed. W. RORDORF, A. TUILIER (SC 248, Paris 1978) 180.

[16] Cited below in section C.I.1.

[17] Cited below in section C.II.1.

[18] Cited below in the next section, at note 27.

[19] SC 336:200-4.

[20] RAHMANI 44-5.

lands 465, the *Der-Balizeh Papyrus* as reconstructed by van Haelst,[21] EgBAS,[22] Addai and Mari,[23] etc. So *ApTrad* 4 is far from normative, and liturgiologists are coming to realize how precarious is any hypothesis that takes this problematic, reconstructed text as its point of departure for anaphoral studies.

However, it is not my intention to resolve here the problem of where and how the pristine eastern anaphoras got their intercessions. I only wish to caution against arguing, as some have, that the preanaphoral transfer of gifts and *its* concomitant diptychs, antedate the emergence of anaphoral intercessions and *their* concomitant diptychs, or that anaphoral intercessions resulted from a shift of the preanaphoral diptychs into the eucharistic prayer. There is no sure basis for such a view, as I shall explain more fully below.

So it will be preferable to treat separately what I take to be distinct and, indeed, quite possibly historically unrelated liturgical units.[24] From the time when a relatively consistent corpus of textual evidence appears in the fourth century, we see three types of intercessory material in the eucharist, in four places:

1. The *preces* or Prayers of the Faithful, those orations or litanies that traditionally followed the lections and homily at the end of the Liturgy of the Word.
2. The intercessions within the anaphora itself, an integral part of the text of the eucharistic prayer recited by the presiding celebrant.
3. The diaconal diptychs proclaimed during the preanaphoral rites, or during the anaphora itself, though in no wise part of the text of the latter.
4. The litany of intercessions following the anaphora.

This final item [4], a later overflow from the anaphora itself, will not concern us here.[25] The most ancient and universal usage is probably [1]. It is seen in the earliest sources, and eventually everywhere, before

[21] J. VAN HAELST, "Une nouvelle reconstitution du Papyrus liturgique de Dêr-Balizeh," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 45 (1969) 447-8. Der-Balizeh is the Monastery of St. Apollonius near Asyût in Egypt.

[22] DORESSE-LANNE 22-9.

[23] MACOMBER 364-9.

[24] DIX, *Shape* 509, is of the same opinion.

[25] I have treated it elsewhere, in TAFT, "The Litany."

being suppressed in some traditions at a later date. It, too, is beyond the scope of our study. Anaphoral intercessions [2] are found in all early complete anaphoras except *ApTrad* 4 – though not always in the same part of the anaphora, itself undoubtedly a sign that we are dealing here with second-level developments in the primitive shape of the liturgy.

II. The Original Place of the Ditpychs

From the moment of their first appearance, *preanaphoral* diptychs coexisted with *anaphoral* intercessions. The earliest witness, Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Hom. 15*, 43, describes how the deacon proclaims the diptychs of the living and dead just before the anaphora.[26] Then in *Hom. 16*, 14, after the epiclesis, he alludes to the anaphoral intercessions:

> He [the bishop] ends the divine liturgy (tešmeštā ālāhāitā) by offering prayer for all whom it is our rule to mention in church at all times. Then he goes on to the commemoration of those who have died.[27]

Here, at least, it is obvious that the anaphoral intercessions cannot have resulted from a shift of the diptychs to the anaphora. Indeed, since we see anaphoral intercessions earlier[28] than our first witness to the diptychs, that argument can no longer be sustained. The provenance of these two units must, therefore, be considered distinct, even if they are found to be related in most later liturgical systems.

In other areas, dominated by the uses of Alexandria, Jerusalem, Antioch, Constantinople, Rome, the diptychs, if they were originally ever before the anaphora (and we have no evidence for that), had, by the turn of the fourth-fifth century, already been delayed to coincide with the intercessions. Indeed, the evolution could have been just the opposite of what is supposed: pre-existing anaphoral intercessions could have attracted the diptychs to their present place in the anaphora in all oriental traditions except the Mesopotamian East Syrian and Tikritan, and Maronite *Šarar*.

[26] ST 145:527-9, cited below in section C.V.1.

[27] ST 145:555.

[28] In *Didache* 10.5; Sarapion XIII, 16-19; Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat. 5*, 8-10; *ApConst* VIII, 12:40-49; cf. notes 15-17, 19 above.

This is what Pope Innocent I (401-417) insisted on, at any rate, in his famous letter of March 19, 416, to Decentius, bishop of Eugubium – Gubbio in Umbria – 160 km north of Rome. Among sundry Umbrian liturgical usages not in conformity with Roman practice for which the pope reproves this suffragan, is the custom, mentioned also by Jerome,[29] of the deacon reciting the names of the offerers. In Gallican and Iberian usage, as we have seen, this took place during the preanaphoral rites.[30] After the transfer and deposition of the gifts, the priest proclaimed the *praefatio missae*, a lengthy admonition exposing the meaning of the feast being celebrated, and the deacon read the list of the *nomina offerentium*. The presider concluded this diptychal proclamation with a collect, the *collectio post nomina*.[31] There followed the kiss of peace and the anaphora. From extant seventh-century collects *post nomina*, it is clear that the *nomina* included not only the *offerentes quorum oblatio* – i.e., those whose offering was offered; but also those *pro quibus* – i.e., those for whom the offerings were made, including the departed.[32]

Innocent derides this Gallican and Visigothic usage as superfluous:

> Concerning the recitation of the names before the priest says the canon and commends by his prayer the offering of those whose names are to be recited, you yourself in your wisdom recognize how superfluous it is to pro-

[29] Below at notes 61-2.

[30] See the excellent commentary of CABIÉ 36-44, which I follow here. Also, CONNOLLY, "Innocent I," 215-26, which CABIÉ (44 note 1) discounts; B. CAPELLE, "Innocent Ier et le canon de la messe," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 19 (1952) 5-16 = ID., *Travaux liturgiques* II. (Louvain 1962) 236-47; and the comments in E.C. RATCLIFF, A.H. COURATIN, "The Early Roman 'Canon Missae'," *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 20 (1969) 218-9.

[31] See, for example, ISIDORE OF SEVILLE, *De ecclesiasticis officiis* I, 15.1-2, PL 83:752B-53A; K. GAMBER, *Ordo antiquus gallicanus. Die gallikanische Meßritus des 6. Jahrhunderts* (Textus patristici et liturgici 6, Regensburg 1965) 35-6; canons 28-29 in the (*post* 400) collection attributed to the Council of Elvira (Illiberis) in Andalusia (305-306), PL 84:305AB. On this synod, full discussion and sources in M. MEIGNE, "Concile ou collection d'Elvire?" *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 70 (1975) 361-87; cf. VAN DE PAVERD, "Intercessions," 323 note 87; further literature and editions in MEYER, *Eucharistie* 154-61.

[32] L.C. MOHLBERG (ed.), *Die Mone-Messen. Missale Gallicanum vetus* (Rome 1958) 77, 83, 87, cited CABIÉ 43.

> nounce the name of one whose sacrifice you have not yet offered to God, since nothing is unknown to him. Hence the oblations are to be commended first, and then the names of those whose [gifts] they are should be announced, so that they be named during the holy mysteries, and not during the other [rites] which we put before [the mysteries], so that by the mysteries themselves we might open the way for the prayers that follow.[33]

It does not seem that Innocent's views met with general agreement throughout the West. Liturgy is by nature conservative, popular local usages always tenacious, so even after Pepin III (751-768) officially accepted the Roman liturgy in Gaul, apparently in 754,[34] Charlemagne (768-814) has to repeat the prohibition, appealing directly to Innocent's authority in canon 54 of his *Capitulare ecclesiasticum* of 789: "... ut nomina puplice non recitentur ante precum sacerdotalem." Five years later, in 794, canon 51 of the Council of Frankfurt must reiterate the same decree.[35]

Innocent's theology may show us the suitability of what the Church now does, but it cannot show us what the Churches formerly did, and from available sources I do not believe it possible to prove where the anaphoral intercessions and diptychs came from, and when. I would presume, however, that the original reading of the *nomina offerentium* and of those *pro quibus* they offered accompanied the presentation of the gifts, as in old Gallican usage[36] – that seems the logical place for the names of offerers and those for whom they offer – and that the intercessions attracted them to the anaphora only later. But it would be hazardous to argue for a genetic link between anaphoral intercessions and diptychs when in Theodore of Mopsuestia and Narsai we see the continued recitation of diptychs in the preanaphora even though the anaphoral intercessions were already in place.

[33] CABIÉ 22:44-52: "De nominibus vero recitandis antequam precem sacerdos faciat, atque eorum oblationes quorum nomina recitanda sunt sua oratione commendet quam superfluum sit, et ipse pro tua prudentia recognoscis, ut cuius hostiam necdum Deum offeras, eius ante nomen insinues, quamvis illi incognitum nihil sit. Prius ergo oblationes sunt commendandae, ac tunc eorum nomina quorum sunt edicenda, ut inter sacra mysteria nominentur, non inter alia quae ante praemittimus ut ipsis mysteriis viam futuris precibus aperiamus."

[34] JUNGMANN, MS I, 74-5.

[35] MGH Legum I, ed. G.H. PERTZ (Hannover 1835) 62, 75.

[36] DIX, *Shape* 510, shares this view.

III. Intercessions and Diptychs – How they Differ

How do anaphoral intercessions and diptychs differ? There seems to be no general agreement on the topic. Some papyrologists cry "diptychs!" too quickly whenever they spot names in one of their Greek or Coptic fragments.[37] Others include under the heading "diptychs" ecclesial lists and commemorations that I would not assign to the category.[38] Ever sober in his analysis of liturgical phenomena, Edmund Bishop may be jejune in the way he defines diptychs, but he seems nearer to the true least common denominator when he asserts that, extrinsically, at least, it is the minister who makes clear the difference between anaphoral intercessions and diptychs: the *presider* (bishop or presbyter) recited the intercessions; the *deacon* announced the diptychs.[39]

Bishop further distinguishes the two genre as to their content:

> Slight as are the extant records they all point to the conclusion...that in the earlier period, and until the spread of the practice of silent recital of the anaphora (canon), the diptychs consisted of a mere list of names, the only addition being (since the names were read out in separate categories, bishops, priests, laymen; dead, living) a simple title indicating each category.
>
> So far, then, as the earlier period is concerned there can be no chance of mistake or confusion between 'intercession' and 'diptychs'. The one is an integral part of the prayers said aloud by the celebrant, the diptychs a mere list of names read by the deacon.[40]

Later, however, when in the course of the sixth-seventh centuries the presiding celebrant began to recite the anaphora, including its intercessions, silently,[41] the intercessions become contaminated by diptychal

[37] Discussed in chapter III, section D.IV.

[38] E.g. COZZA-LUZI, "De sacris collybis et diptychis," 138-43; and, more recently, MELIA.

[39] "Comments" IV-VII, 396.

[40] *Ibid.* 396-7. In support of this, Bishop (*ibid.* 397 note 1) referring, respectively, to his study BISHOP, "Appendix," 101, 100 note 2, 107, cites Sarapion, the Gelasian Sacramentary, the sixth-century diptychs in the Acts of the Synod of Mopsuestia in 550, (see section C.V.3 below), and mid-seventh century Constantinopolitan sources, all of which are re-examined here.

[41] The earliest witnesses to the practice are Syriac writers: NARSAI († 502), *Homily 17* (CONNOLLY, *Narsai* 12-13, 18, 22) for the East-Syrian tradition; JACOB OF SARUG († 521) for the western (CONNOLLY, "Homily on the Mysteries," 284). At Constantinople, in 565 Emperor Justinian I (525-567) stigmatized the abuse in *Novella 137*, 2 and 6 (R. SCHOELL, G. KROLL, eds., *Corpus iuris civilis* III [Berlin 1899] 697, 699); but JOHN MOSCHUS († 619), *Pratum spirituale* 196 (PG

matter,[42] a development common to both East and West that Bishop believes came about because the priest "...was not content simply to stand silent and listen to those parts of the service that fall to others, but must needs repeat to himself secretly what others said aloud."[43]

Grisbrooke in his study of intercessions in the eucharist nuances further the distinction between diptychs and intercessions. Diptychs express the intentions of *individuals*; intercessions, the intentions of the *Church*:

> Diptychs are the liturgical expression of the intentions wherewith individuals make their oblations: they presuppose that intercessory intentions may be attached to individual oblations, primarily for the offerer, and secondarily for others whom he wishes to remember in this way. But individual oblations, as we have seen in a previous article,[44] presuppose the Church's oblation, and similarly individual intercessions presuppose the Church's intercession. And just as the individual obations are taken up into the Church's oblation, which is transformed into the one acceptable and all-powerful oblation, that of Christ himself, so the individual intercessions are taken up into the Church's intercession, that of Christ himself.[45]

In actual fact, Grisbrooke's distinction applies only to one sort of diptychs seen in the early documents, the recitation of the *nomina* of the offerers and those for whom they offered. These simple lists of names may be the primitive basis of later, more developed diptychs. Melia, for instance, believes the recital of the *nomina offerentium* to be

87:3081), still witnesses to the anaphora recited aloud. So it is within those chronological parameters that the change seems to have taken hold and spread, though the mid-11th c. Byzantine liturgical commentary, the *Protheoria* 38 (PG 140:465BC), shows that the silent anaphora still provoked perplexity even at that late date. On the whole issue, yet to receive adequate scholarly treatment, see BISHOP, "Appendix," 121-26.

[42] BISHOP, "Comments" IV-VII, 396, cites as illustrations of this development LEW 93-95, 169, 224, 228-30, 275-84, 438-42.

[43] BISHOP, "Comments" IV-VII, 397 note 1.

[44] W.J. GRISBROOKE, "Oblation at the Eucharist," SL 3 (1964) 227-39; 4 (1965) 37-55.

[45] W.J. GRISBROOKE, "Intercession at the Eucharist" I, SL 4 (1965) 129-55; II.1, SL 5 (1966) 20-44; II.2, SL 5 (1966) 87-103; here II.2, p. 87. One cannot presume, however, that the offerers were always present at the service. Jacob of Sarug († 521) complains of the rich having their servants bring the offerings to church in their stead: CONNOLLY, "Homily on the Memorial," 270 = BEDJAN I, 549-50.

at the origins of the diptychs of the living.[46] But by the end of the fourth century we find the local Church naming in its diptychs the bishops of the major sees within its ecclesial communion, commemorations that can hardly be considered "individual" intentions, as Grisbrooke uses the term, and not those of the Church.

So Bishop's distinction remains the more serviceable one for diptychs, though when employing it we must remind ourselves that liturgical usage precedes our categorization of its various forms into discrete liturgical units, that "diptychs" or "anaphoral intercessions" are but analogous terms specifying disparate if similar liturgical practices, and that not all individuals within the species bear all and always exactly the same characteristics. Indeed, as we shall see, diptychs show far more variety than their different placement alone would indicate.

So words are words and things are things, and we must not allow categories and nomenclature of our own devising to become a procrustean bed. But it would be equally fatuous to dispense with them. Without distinctions and groupings, the organization of material into categories, there is no possibility of understanding or explanation. So I shall retain the customary distinction between anaphoral commemorations/intercessions and diptychs, without, however, agreeing that one must cry "contamination" whenever *nomina* are found in the former, or whenever anything besides names (saints, ecumenical councils, the Church) is listed in the latter.

B. THE NOMINA IN THE EARLY SOURCES

In the present state of the question, unless I have misread the literature, diptychs, at their most basic, have to do with *names proclaimed aloud, usually by the deacon, for liturgical remembrance.* From the beginning, in some traditions at least, such a proclamation was understood as implicitly including everyone, even those not named, and the diptychs may well have concluded with a general intercession in that sense. At a later date, other general intercessions were appended, paralleling those of the anaphoral text itself. Let us see how all this

[46] MELIA 212.

develops in the earliest extant sources. Apart from some fleeting earlier references, these sources are mostly from the second half of the fourth century. I shall take them more or less in chronological order, grouped according to geographical areas.

1. *Ignatius of Antioch*

Ignatius of Antioch († ca. 110-118), *Ad Smyrn.* 5:3, says that the names of false teachers are not written down and commemorated:

> Since they are unbelievers, I did not think it right for me to write down their names (τὰ δὲ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν...ἐγγράψαι). Rather, far be it from me even to remember (μνημονεύειν) them until they repent...[47]

It is not certain whether Ignatius is describing an actual practice or simply speaking metaphorically, in the sense of the biblical (LXX) "Book of Life" or "of the Living" (Ex 32:32-33; Ps 68:29, 138:16; Phil 4:3, Rev 13:8, 17:8, 20:15, 21:27), as in Ps 68:29 (LXX): "Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and with the righteous let them not be written."[48]

2. *Cyprian of Carthage*

In North Africa this custom had been liturgicized as early as ca. 249 A.D., when Cyprian, *Ep. 1*, 2, speaks of "naming" the dead at the altar, in reference to one considered unworthy of such commemoration:

> nec offerretur pro eo nec sacrificium pro eius dormitione celebraretur, neque enim apud altare Dei meretur nominari in sacerdotum prece qui ab altare sacerdotes et ministros uoluit auocari.[49]

By the next century, this usage is general throughout the East.

[47] IGNACE D'ANTIOCHE, *Lettres*, ed. P. TH. CAMELOT (SC 10, 4th ed. Paris 1969) 136.

[48] Cf. KOEP 110.

[49] CSEL 3.2:466.

C. THE SOURCES OF LATE ANTIQUITY

I. Egypt

The earliest actual liturgical texts to indicate the reading of the names of persons commemorated, two fourth-fifth century Egyptian anaphoras, both show them concomitant with the anaphoral intercessions.

1. *The Euchology of Sarapion*

The mid-fourth century *Euchology of Sarapion* XIV, 17-19, an Egyptian Greek service book attributed to Sarapion, bishop of Thmuis in the Province of Thebais Secunda in Upper Egypt from before 339 until after 362,[50] provides at the end of the anaphora an early, rudimentary series of such intercessions, attached to the Logos-epiclesis (XIII, 15) after the words of institution (XIII, 12-14), and ending with the concluding doxology of the anaphora (XIII, 19):

> **XIII.15.** Let come, O God of truth, your holy Word upon this bread...and upon this cup...and make all who partake to receive a medicine of life for the healing of every disease, and for the empowering of all advancement and virtue; not for condemnation, O God of truth, nor for censure and reproach.
>
> **16.** For we have called upon you, the uncreated, through the only-begotten in the Holy Spirit. Let this people receive mercy; let it be counted worthy of advancement; let angels be sent out to be present among the people for bringing to naught the evil one, and for establishing of the Church.
>
> **17.** And we entreat also for all who have fallen asleep, of whom is also the remembrance.
>
> **18.** *After the recitation of the names*: Sanctify these souls, for you know them all; sanctify all (souls) that are fallen asleep in the Lord and number them among all your holy powers, and give them a place and a mansion in your kingdom. **19.** Receive also the thanksgiving of the people, and bless those who offered the offerings and the thanksgivings, and grant health and soundness and joy and all advancement of soul and body to this people. Through your only-begotten Jesus Christ in Holy Spirit...[51]

[50] On Thmuis and its bishops, see FEDALTO II, 611.

[51] FUNK II, 174-77 = PE 130-32; trans. adapted from JC 77-78. Much has been written on this source, though nothing definitive. In addition to its treatment in general works on the eucharistic anaphora or on the eucharist in Egypt,

Dix considers the recitation of the names here "a fairly recent interpolation, with no connection with what precedes and follows."[52]

2. *The Strasbourg Papyrus*

The fourth-fifth century papyrus *Strasbourg Gr. 254*, an early redaction of what will become the presanctus of MK, concludes, insofar as the fragment can be reconstructed, as follows:

> We pray and beseech you, remember your holy and only Catholic Church, all your peoples and all your flocks. The peace which is from heaven, give to all our hearts, but grant us also the peace of this life. The [...] of the earth peaceful things towards us, and towards your ⟨holy⟩ name, the prefect of the province, the army, the princes, councils
> [*...about one-third of a page is lacking here, and what survives is in places too fragmentary to be restored*].
> ⟨for seedtime and⟩ harvest [...] preserve, for the poor of ⟨your⟩ people, for all of us who call upon ⟨your⟩ name, for all who hope in you.
>
> To the souls of those who have fallen asleep give rest; *remember those of whom we make mention today, both those whose names we say [and] whose we do not say* [...] ⟨Remember⟩ our orthodox fathers and bishops everywhere; and grant us to have a part and lot with the fair [...] of your holy prophets, apostles, and martyrs, whose entreaties re⟨ceive⟩ [...] grant

see A. BAUMSTARK, "Die Anaphora von Thmuis und ihre Überarbeitung durch den hl. Serapion," *Römische Quartalschrift* 18 (1904) 123-42; B. BOTTE, "L'Eucologe de Sérapion est-il authentique?" OC 48 (1964) 50-56; B. CAPELLE, "L'anaphore de Sérapion. Essai d'exégèse," Mus 59 (1946) 425-43 = ID., *Travaux liturgiques* II (Louvain 1962) 344-58; G.J. CUMING, "Thmuis Revisited: Another Look at the Prayers of Bishop Sarapion," *Theological Studies* 41 (1980) 568-75, who defends the document's authenticity (575); K. GAMBER, "Die Serapion-Anaphora ihrem ältesten Bestand nach untersucht," OKS 16 (1967) 33-42; E. MAZZA, "L'anafora di Serapione: una ipotesi di interpretazione," EL 95 (1981) 510-28; A.D. NOCK, "Liturgical Notes, 1. The Anaphora of Serapion," JTS 30 (1929) 381-90; P.E. RODOPOULOS, "Doctrinal Teaching in the "Sacramentary" of Serapion of Thmuis," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 9 (1963-64) 201-14; ID., "The Sacramentary of Serapion." From a thesis for the degree of B. Litt. within the University of Oxford, *θεολογία* 28 (1957) 252-75, 420-39, 578-91; 29 (1958) 45-54, 208-17; A. VERHEUL, "La prière eucharistique dans l'Euchologe de Sérapion," *Questions liturgiques* 62 (1981) 43-51. I owe some of the above references to Maxwell E. Johnson, a doctoral candidate in liturgical studies in the Department of Theology at the University of Notre Dame (USA), who is preparing his dissertation on this sacramentary under the direction of Prof. Paul F. Bradshaw.

[52] *Shape* 499.

> them through our Lord [...]; through whom be glory to you unto the ages of ages.[53]

Note the indiscriminate mingling in both these Egyptian anaphoras of the intercessions for the living and dead.

Can these texts be taken as showing already a distinction between *anaphoral intercessions* read by the presiding bishop or presbyter, and *diptychs* or names read perhaps by the deacon, even if the later nomenclature is still absent? Nothing justifies such a conclusion, though we have here, clearly, the embryonic form of what would soon be separated into distinct liturgical units, possibly as a result of the multiplication of the names to be proclaimed. The reasons for such a development should be obvious. Every pastor knows that people wish to hear read aloud in church the names of those for whom they have made an offering and requested prayers. When such lists became so long as to be a nuisance, what better solution than to leave their proclamation to the deacon? It was his job, after all, to give the congregation its orders and announce the intentions it was to pray for.

3. *Didascalia Arabica*

The *Didascalia Arabica* XXXV, 14, a document translated in 1295 from a post-fifth century Sahidic redaction of *ApConst* I-VI,[54] reflects a tradition akin to that of *TestDom* I, 19.[55]

> Let the deacons write down the names of those who, each day, bring gifts, whether they be for the living or for the dead, so that the priest, when he prays, commemorate them; and likewise, let the hebdomadary deacon com-

[53] M. ANDRIEU, P. COLLOMP, "Fragments sur papyrus de l'anaphore de saint Marc," *Revue des sciences religieuses* 8 (1928) 489-515: Greek text 500-1 = PE 116-8; trans. adapted from JC 54. Basic bibliography in PE 116, to which add B.D. SPINKS, "A Complete Anaphora? A Note on Strasbourg Gr. 254," *The Heythrop Journal* 25 (1984) 51-9; and especially CUMING. The intercessions in the Strasbourg text and the later related MK have been thoroughly analysed by H. ENGBERDING, "Das anaphorische Fürbittgebet der griechischen Markusliturgie," OCP 30 (1964) 398-446.

[54] FUNK II, xxviii-xxxii. On the two redactions of the Arabic *Didascalia*, the more important of which is cited here, and edited by William SOLIMAN, see SAMIR KHALIL's review, in OCP 48 (1982) 207-9, of Soliman's edition: *Kitāb Ta'ālim ar-Rusul ad-Dusqūliyyah* (Cairo 1979). According to Samir (207), the 1295 Arabic version was made from a copy of the Sahidic text dated 926.

[55] Treated below in section C.II.3.

> memorate them; and let those standing near the [sanctuary] veil, as well as the people, pray for them at the same time.[56]

Though the text is ambiguous, it is obviously not just the names of the offerers, but especially the names of those living and dead *for whom* the offerings are made, that are recorded and prayed for.

Note, however, that even though this text is a translation from the Sahidic, that does not prove it reflects Egyptian usage. Such ancient church orders, to which apostolic authority was usually attributed, were translated and circulated throughout the Churches of Late Antiquity irrespective of their provenance. Their presence in this or that area is no indication that what they prescribe was ever actually in use in the local Church in question. And as a matter of fact, the practices described here resemble more those witnessed to in *TestDom* I, 19, than in Egyptian sources.

II. Palestine

1. *Cyril (John II) of Jerusalem (post 380)*

Around the same time something similar is developing in Palestine – indeed, developments are taken one step further. In Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.* 5, 8-10, the Jerusalem intercessions are neatly separated into categories, with prayers first for the living, then for the dead, an order that will be preserved thereafter in most eucharistic anaphoras. After commenting on the Sanctus (6) and consecratory Spirit-epiclesis (7) – the first time we see one – Cyril continues:

> **8.** Then, after the spiritual sacrifice, the bloodless service, has been perfected, we beseech God over that sacrifice of propitiation for the common peace of the Churches, for the tranquillity of the world, for emperors, for armies and auxiliaries, for the sick, for the oppressed; and, praying in general for all who need help, we all offer this sacrifice.
>
> **9.** Then we commemorate also those who have fallen asleep; first patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs; that God, through their prayers and intercession, may receive our supplication. Then also for the holy fathers and bishops who have fallen asleep before us, and, in a word, for all those from among us who have fallen asleep before us; believing that it will be

[56] My trans. from the Latin version of FUNK II, 125.

the greatest profit to the souls for whom supplication is offered in the presence of the holy and most dread sacrifice.

10. And I wish to persuade you by an example. For I know that many say this: what does it profit a soul that leaves this world with sins or without sins, if it be commemorated in the prayer? Now surely, if a king were to banish certain ones who had given him offense, and their relatives wove a crown and offered it to him on behalf of those subjected to his vengeance, would he not grant a remission of their punishment? In the same way, when we too offer him our supplications for those who have fallen asleep, even though they were sinners, we weave no crown but offer up Christ slain for our sins, propitiating God, the lover of humankind, for them and for ourselves.[57]

Cyril, it will be noted, places the intercessions right after the consecratory Spirit-epiclesis, thought to be one of his innovations.[58] This is the earliest instance of what will become the common structure of Antiochene-type anaphoras, where, as in the text of Sarapion just cited and in *ApConst* VIII, 12:39-49,[59] the intercessions flow from the epiclesis as a natural continuation of its petitions for the consecration and fruitfulness of the gifts.

But I would agree with Bates that the decidedly different context of the intercessions in the Egyptian system of UrMK in the Strasbourg Papyrus is equally smooth and need not be seen as an "intrusion" interrupting the flow, as Coquin would have it.[60]

2. *Jerome (ca. 347-†419)*

St. Jerome's commentaries *On Ezekiel* (AD 406) and *On Jeremiah* (AD 415-419) testify to the deacon reciting publicly the names of those who had made offerings for the service, and what they had donated:

[57] SC 126bis:156-61. On the question of date and authorship see 177-87.

[58] Dix, *Shape* 198-200; 277-81; 350.

[59] SC 336:198-205.

[60] W.H. Bates, "Thanksgiving and Intercession in the Liturgy of St. Mark," BELS 19:111-9; cf. R. Coquin, "L'anaphore alexandrine de Saint Marc," Mus 82 (1969) 313. Bates (112-7) also argues for the priority of the Egyptian-MK system, with the intercessions preceding the epiclesis and communion, as they do also in the Anaphora of Addai and Mari (Macomber 364-9), over what one sees in Cyril and Sarapion, usually considered the earliest witnesses to the primitive order. Van de Paverd has argued the same for Antioch in his reinterpretation of Chrysostom, *De sacerdotio* VI, 4 (see section C.IV.3 below, at note 83).

In Hiezechielem VI, 18:5/9:...publiceque diaconus in ecclesiis recitet offerentium nomina: 'Tantum offert illa, ille tantum pollicitus est'; placentque sibi ad plausum populi...[61]

In Hieremiam II, 11: At nunc publice recitantur offerentium nomina et redemtio peccatorum mutatur in laudem nec meminerunt uiduae illius in euangelio, quae in gazophylacium duo aera mittendo omnium diuitum uicit donaria.[62]

Since Jerome's works were written in Latin for Latins, Connolly believes this biting critique to be aimed at a western liturgical usage.[63] But these commentaries were composed in Bethlehem, and Jerome could equally well have had Palestinian usage in mind, though that issue in no way affects our thesis here.

3. *Testamentum Domini*[64]

TestDom is a church order translated into Syriac in 687 from the lost, late fifth-century Greek original first heard of when cited by Severus, Monophysite patriarch of Antioch (512-518).[65] *TestDom* I, 19 and dependent documents also witness to the relationship between the offerings of the faithful and the *nomina*. From these texts it is clear that the faithful offered prosphoras for the living and dead, whose names were recorded for commemoration at the eucharist. *TestDom* I, 19 describes a church arrangement with the diakonikon near the entrance,[66] a system

[61] CCL 75:238.

[62] CCL 74:116.

[63] CONNOLLY, "Innocent I," 216 note 1; cf. VAN DE PAVERD, "Intercessions," 323 note 88.

[64] On this source, see R.G. COQUIN, "Le Testamentum Domini: problèmes de tradition textuelle," PDO 5 (1974) 165-88; R. BEYLOT (ed.), *Le Testamentum domini éthiopien* (Louvain 1984) vi. The text cited below is found also in this version, 10, *ibid.* 158. Grant White, a doctoral candidate in liturgical studies in the Department of Theology at the University of Notre Dame (USA), is preparing his dissertation on *TestDom*, under the direction of Prof. Paul F. Bradshaw.

[65] *TestDom* II, 10 is cited in *Letter IX.3 to Thecla*, E.W. BROOKS (ed.), *The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus Patriarch of Antioch in the Syriac Version of Athanasius of Nisibis* (London 1902-1904) I.2:482 (= Syriac); II.2:426 (= English trans.).

[66] I, 19, RAHMANI 22-3.

closer to that of Palestine (Hauran or the Negev) than of North Syria.[67]

The section concerning the commemorations reads:

> 1. It is for the commemoration (m'ahḏānūṯā) that a place is built, so that when the priest sits there with the protodeacon, with the readers, 2. he writes down [the names] of those who offer oblations, 3. or of those for whom they have offered, 4. so that when the holy things (quḏšē) are offered (meṭqarḇin) by the bishop, 5. the reader or even the protodeacon names in commemoration those for whom the priests and the people offer in supplication.[68]

It would seem that the gifts were offered in the sacristy before the liturgy (**1**). Ministers recorded the names of both the offerers (**2**) and those for whom they offered (**3**), and these names were read later, by the protodeacon or reader (**5**). Though it is not altogether clear just when this proclamation took place, the clause "when the holy things are offered by the bishop" (**4**) seems to fit the anaphora best.

III. Cyprus

Around the same time we have the witness of Epiphanius of Salamis (ca. 315-483), born in Palestine and a monk there for thirty years before becoming bishop of Constantia, the ancient Salamis in Cyprus, in 367. In *Panarion haer.* 75.7:1, 4-5, written around 374-377, he speaks "about the practice of saying the names of the dead" (περὶ τοῦ ὀνόματα λέγειν τῶν τελευτησάντων), and, like other Fathers of the epoch, adds the motivation for this liturgical innovation (75.7: 4-5):

> We make commemoration (ποιούμεθα τὴν μνήμην) both of the just and of sinners; for sinners to implore God's mercy for them; but for the just and fathers and patriarchs, prophets and apostles and evangelists and martyrs and confessors, bishops and anchorites and their whole order (τάγμα), in order to distinguish the Lord Jesus Christ from the order of men through the honor given him, and to render him worship, being aware that the Lord is not on a level with any man...[69]

[67] On the church arrangement and place of origin of *TestDom*, see Descoeudres 45-9.

[68] *Ibid.* 24-5. I am grateful to my colleague Jacques Isaac for assistance in translating the literal sense of the Syriac text.

[69] K. Holl (ed.), *Epiphanius* 3 (GCS 37, Leipzig 1933) 338-9.

We have no way of knowing just what Epiphanius is referring to, but it is not improbable that he knew a liturgical usage like the one reflected in the sources previously cited.

No one, however, has yet used the word "diptychs."

IV. Antiochia

1. *The Apostolic Constitutions*

The lengthy anaphora in *ApConst* VIII, 12, from the environs of Antioch ca. 380, inserts between the epiclesis (VIII, 12: 39) and concluding doxology (VIII, 12: 50) a highly developed series of anaphoral intercessions (VIII, 12: 40-49), but with no mention of diptychs or the recitation of names.[70] Note that here too, as in the Egyptian sources, the commemorations of the living and dead are still mingled indiscriminately, and the dead faithful are listed right along with the saints.

2. *Theodore of Mopsuestia*

But we know that even earlier, in the metropolis itself, it was customary to name the dead at the eucharist. Theodore of Mopsuestia's (ca. 350-428) earliest work, the *Commentary on the Psalms*, written while he was still in Antioch, barely twenty years old and not yet a presbyter, says the following with regard to Ps 68:29 ("Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and with the righteous let them not be written"): "It used to be an old custom among the Jews that the names of the virtuous deceased ones be written [down] – which is also observed by us now in the churches."[71]

3. *John Chrysostom*

Theodore's schoolmate John Chrysostom, also a presbyter of Antioch from 386-397 until he was ordained bishop of Constantinople in February 398, speaks of the liturgical commemoration of the dead in

[70] SC 339:200-4.

[71] R. Devreesse (ed.), *Le commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste sur les psaumes (I-LXXX)* (ST 93, Vatican 1939) 457-8.

his Antiochene sermon *In 1 Cor hom. 41*, 4-5. In response to the fear that a loved one has died in his sins, Chrysostom replies that we can help him obtain God's forgiveness in several ways:

> **1.** One should...help him as far as possible not by tears, but by prayers and supplications and almsgiving and offerings. **2.** For these things were not devised to no purpose, **3.** nor is it in vain that we make commemoration of the departed during the divine mysteries, and come forward on their behalf, praying to the Lamb who is lying there, who takes away the sin of the world, but in order that from this some relief might come to them. **4.** Not in vain does he who stands at the altar cry out when the fearsome mysteries are accomplished: **5.** "*For all those who have fallen asleep in Christ, and for those who make commemorations of them* (Ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ κεκοιμημένων καὶ τῶν τὰς μνείας ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐπιτελούντων)." **6.** For if no commemorations were effected for them, these things would not have been said. For what we do is not a mere stage show, God forbid! For the Spirit ordains that these things be done. **7.** Let us, then, come to their rescue by making commemoration for their sake. For if the children of Job were purged by the sacrifice of their father, why do you doubt that our offering for the departed is of some relief to them? ...**8.** So let us not be weary in coming to the aid of the departed and in offering prayers on their behalf, for the common Purifier of the oikoumene is here present. **9.** That is why we confidently pray for the whole world at that time, and name (καλοῦμεν) them together with martyrs, confessors, priests. **10.** For we are all one body, even if some members are more glorious than others, and it is possible from every source – from the prayers, from the gifts on their behalf, from those named (καλουμένων) with them – to gather pardon for them.[72]

Authors dispute whether this passage and the remarkably similar one in Chrysostom's Constantinopolitan sermon, *In Acta apost. hom. 21*, 4,[73] refer to the diptychs, the anaphoral intercessions, or the litany that from the fourth century has followed the anaphora in the Antiochene-type liturgical ordo. To me it seems clear that Chrysostom is referring to intercessions during the anaphora. One should offer prayers and gifts (**3, 8, 10**), he tells us, and commemorate (**3, 7**) and intercede (**3-5, 8-10**) for the dead (**1, 7-9**), and name them together with the saints and clergy (**9-10**), and indeed everyone (**10**). This should be done when the mysteries are accomplished (**3-4**), with the sacred ministers still standing before the altar (**4**), after the consecration and before communion, while the Lord Jesus is lying on the altar (**3, 8**). The diptychs,

[72] PG 61:361.

[73] PG 60:170, cited and analyzed at the beginning of chapter IV.

it seems, were proclaimed at the same time (**5**), as I shall argue below.

Van de Paverd, who has studied the Chrysostom texts most recently and thoroughly, first placed the diptychs here too.[74] Against this interpretation, K. Gamber expressed the view that Chrysostom is referring rather to the litany following the anaphora,[75] a view van de Paverd himself has come to espouse.[76] One cannot just dismiss van de Paverd's reasons in favor of the litany, especially in the light of the corresponding postanaphoral litany of *ApConst* VIII, 13:2-9, which does have petitions for those (except the confessors) Chrysostom mentions in his homily: the whole Church, the priests (13:4), the martyrs (13:6), and "For those who have gone to their repose in faith..." (13:6).[77]

Still, I do not find suasive the arguments advanced against considering this text as evidence for the diptychs. Van de Paverd argues as follows:

1. The anaphoral intercessions in Antioch came before the epiclesis.[78] But in the text of Chrysostom cited it is obvious that the consecration has been accomplished already and the sacrifice completed (**3-4, 8**). Hence the text cannot refer to the intercessions.[79]
2. But if the commemorations mentioned came after the consecration (this is certain), then they cannot be the diptychs. For the diptychs were either before the anaphora as in the East Syrian, Maronite *Šarar*, and Gallican traditions,[80] or accompanied the anaphoral intercessions, as elsewhere. But since both possibilities are already excluded by argument [1] above, because the anaphoral intercessions and diptychs preceded the consecration in Antiochene usage, Chrysostom cannot be referring to the diptychs either.
3. That leaves the litany after the anaphora. Could the diptychs have accompanied this litany? That seems hardly likely, so van

[74] VAN DE PAVERD, *Meßliturgie* 348ff.
[75] Reviewing van de Paverd's book in BZ 64 (1971) 373.
[76] VAN DE PAVERD, "Intercessions," 327ff.
[77] SC 336:204-6. On this litany see TAFT, "The litany."
[78] VAN DE PAVERD, "Intercessions," 304-8, 312-3.
[79] *Ibid.* 333.
[80] *Ibid.* 322ff.

> de Paverd prefers to consider the text as simply referring to this litany, and rejects the notion that Chrysostom is speaking about the diptychs at all.

Van de Paverd is certainly right in insisting that the phrases in both these parallel passages of Chrysostom's two homilies – *In 1 Cor hom. 41*, 4-5, from Antioch, and *In Acta apost. hom. 21*, 4, from Constantinople – which some have taken as referring to the diptychs, have in view the same liturgical prayer as the other allusions in the text.[81] In short, *the context of the entirety of both passages is the same.* So if part refers to the anaphora, the whole refers to the anaphora; if part refers to the litany, the whole refers to the litany.

My main problem is with [1], van de Paverd's ordering of the components of the Antiochene anaphora, a sequence comparative liturgy renders highly improbable, and one, at any rate, that van de Paverd's argument from Chrysostom's Antiochene work *De sacerdotio* VI, 4:20-40, certainly does not prove.[82] In that text, Chrysostom lauds the dignity of the priesthood by enumerating the priest's awesome responsibilities at the liturgy:

> 1. For what sort of man ought one to be who serves as ambassador of a whole city? – a city, do I say? rather, of the whole world! – and who supplicates God to be compassionate to the sins of all, not only of the living but also of the dead? ...For as if he were in charge of the whole world, and the father of all, he approaches God, praying him to extinguish wars everywhere, to put an end to all civil disturbances, for peace, prosperity, and for speedy deliverance from all the evils, public and private, that menace each one. He ought in all things to excel all those for whom he prays... 2. But when he invokes even the Holy Spirit, and performs the sacrifice that inspires the greatest awe, 3. and continuously touches the common Lord of the universe, where, tell me, shall we rank him? What degree of purity shall we require from him, and what measure of piety? 4. For consider how the hands must be which administer these substances, 5. of what quality the tongue that utters those words, 6. how the soul that has received such a Spirit should be purer and holier than anyone else. 7. Even angels surround the priest at that moment, and the whole order of heavenly powers shouts, and the space around the altar is crowded [with them] in honor of him who lies upon it.[83]

[81] *Ibid.* 322.

[82] *Ibid.* 304-8.

[83] JEAN CHRYSOSTOME, *Sur le sacerdoce (Dialogue et Homélie)*, ed. A.-M. MALINGREY (SC 272, Paris 1980) 314-6.

Previously, van de Paverd had argued that Chrysostom in this text places the epiclesis (2) after the intercessions (1) for rhetorical reasons, not because that was the actual order of the liturgy in Antioch at that time.[84] I do not find convincing van de Paverd's reasons for changing this opinion.[85] For they depend entirely on the argument that Chrysostom's description of the liturgy at this point is so tightly crafted that he could not be grouping together the two most solemn moments that climax the eucharist, the epiclesis or consecration (2) and the participation in the fruits of that consecration at communion (4), if in actual practice they were separated by anaphoral intercessions (1) inserted between them as in all extant texts of the traditional Antiochene-type anaphora from *ApConst* VIII, 12 (ca. 380) on.

A closer examination of the *De sacerdotio* text shows how arbitrary such an interpretation can be. For as it stands, one could just as well argue that the order presented by Chrysostom is:

1. intercessions for the living and dead, and for the peace and welfare of all (**1**)
2. the consecration or epiclesis and oblation of the gifts (**2**)
3. the manual acts (fraction, etc.) following the anaphora, just before communion (**3**)
4. the distribution of communion (**4**)
5. again, the words of institution (**5**) and epiclesis (**6**)
6. and, finally, the angelic chant (**7**), i.e. the Sanctus.

So to me, the possibility of a purely rhetorical ordering of liturgical elements seems far more probable in the light of comparative liturgy: all contemporary and later Antiochene-type anaphoras maintain unvaryingly the order 1) institution narrative, 2) epiclesis, 3) intercessions, 4) communion.

Ironically, in the very same article, the next text van de Paverd analyzes, Chrysostom's *In Eph hom. 3*, 5, enumerates components of the eucharist in the following order:[86]

1. the consecrated elements being brought out for communion
2. the sacrificing of Christ and his becoming the Lamb of God

[84] *Meßliturgie* 346ff, 359-60.
[85] VAN DE PAVERD, "Intercessions," 307-8.
[86] PG 62:29; VAN DE PAVERD, "Intercessions," 309.

3. the litany after the anaphora
4. the opening of the curtains of the sanctuary.

But it is obvious that in the actual liturgical celebration they had to occur in the order 2-4-3-1. This alone demonstrates, I think, that one cannot push Chrysostom's liturgical descriptions too far, taking them, without further corroboration, as giving the exact déroulement of the rites, especially in the face of solid contradictory liturgical evidence from the same time and place.

So I still think that both passages, the Antiochene sermon *In 1 Cor hom. 41*, 4-5, and the Constantinopolitan sermon *In Acta apost. 21*, 4, discussed at the beginning of the next chapter, are best interpreted as referring to the anaphoral intercessions following the epiclesis. Their whole context is redolent of the anaphora. And in that same context, Chrysostom also mentions the diaconal cry:

> *For [all] those who have fallen asleep in Christ, and for those who have commemorations made* [or: *who make commemorations] for them* - Ὑπὲρ [πάντων] τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ κεκοιμημένων καὶ τῶν τὰς μνείας ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐπιτελουμένων [ἐπιτελούντων].

In the Antiochene text, "he who stands at the altar" (**4**) proclaims this cry, and that could be the presider. But the parallel Constantinopolitan homily, citing the same exclamation *verbatim* except for the modifier "all" (πάντων) found only in the Antiochene text, and the active (Antioch) or passive (Constantinople) participle, attributes it to the deacon.[87] That means Chrysostom is referring to the diakonika and not to a petition of the anaphoral intercessions read by the priest. These diakonika could be the diptychs of the dead concomitant with the intercessions for them in the anaphora, a thesis confirmed for Constantinople at least by the parallel Constantinopolitan diptychal text of Maximus Confessor, *Relatio motionis*, Acta I, 5, also cited in chapter IV, section A.II.3.

[87] No. **1** in the text cited at the beginning of chapter IV.

V. Cilicia

1. *Theodore of Mopsuestia*

The first unambiguous mention of liturgical diptychs comes from Cilicia north of Antioch (Syria Prima) in the last quarter of the fourth century, in the homilies of Theodore of Mopsuestia, bishop of that town from 392 until his death in 428. Just where Theodore delivered his justly renowned course of catechetical homilies remains unsettled. Some scholars opt for Antioch during the decade of his presbyteral ministry there (he was ordained in 382).[88] Others incline toward Mopsuestia in Cilicia Secunda during Theodore's episcopate.[89] And Botte argued not ineffectively for Tarsus in Cilicia Prima where Theodore was a guest of bishop Diodore, under whom both Theodore and Chrysostom had studied, shortly before being appointed bishop of Mopsuestia.[90] For my part, I think the placement of the diptychs described by Theodore excludes Antioch, and would argue for Mopsuestia or elsewhere in Cilicia.

In *Hom. 15*, 43, after describing the transfer of gifts, diaconal proclamation, accessus prayer of the presider, the greeting and kiss of peace, and the lavabo, Theodore concludes his comments on the pre-anaphoral rites, just before moving on to the diaconal admonition and the dialogue immediately preceding the anaphora, with a word on the diptychs:

> 1. Then all rise, according to the signal given them by the deacon, and look at what is taking place. 2. The names of the living, and of the dead who have passed away in the faith of Christ, are then read from the tablets (pen-

[88] B. ALTANER, *Patrology* (New York 1961) 372; J. QUASTEN, *Patrology* (Westminster, Md. 1960) III, 409; R. DEVREESSE, "Introduction," ST 145:XVI.

[89] H. LIETZMANN, *Die Liturgie des Theodor von Mopsuestia*. Ausgabe aus den Sitzungsberichten der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse 23. (Berlin 1923), reprinted in ID., *Kleine Schriften* 3 (Texte und Untersuchungen 74. Berlin 1962) 71-97, here 72; S. JANERAS, "En quels jours furent prononcées le homélies catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste?" in *Mémorial Msgr. Gabriel Khouri-Sarkis* (Louvain 1969) 133.

[90] B. BOTTE, "L'onction postbaptismale dans l'ancien patriarcat d'Antioche," in *Miscellanea liturgica in onore di S.E. il Cardinale G. Lercaro* (Rome 1967) II, 805-6.

qiṯō) of the church, 3. and it is clear that in the few of them who are mentioned now, 4. all the living and the departed are [implicitly] mentioned.[91]

Here at last we have some hardcore information on the diptychs, at least for Cilicia:

1. They were two lists of actual names, of the living and the dead (2).
2. They were read immediately before the anaphora, probably by the deacon, though Theodore does not actually say so, for he is commenting on them into the context of the other preanaphoral diakonika, and that is what was usual in eastern usage.
3. They were undoubtedly read in that order, first the living, then the dead, if one can judge from later sources.
4. There was some principle of selectivity, for not all but only some of the living and dead were actually named (3).
5. All others, however, were included at least implicity (4), and the proclamation(s) may even have concluded with a general remembrance of all.

2. *Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite*

Probably from the same general area, at the end of the fifth century or the beginning of the sixth, Ps.-Dionysius, *The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* III, 2, also places the diptychs among the preanaphoral rites, between the *pax* and the *lavabo* just before the anaphora:

> And when all have given the kiss of peace to one another, the mystical proclamation of the sacred diptychs (τῶν ἱερῶν πτυχῶν ἀνάρρησις) takes place. After the bishop and the priests have washed their hands with water, the bishop stands in the center of the divine altar... And when the bishop has praised the sacred works of God, he consecrates the most divine mysteries...[92]

The elevation of the gifts, communion, etc., follow. Ps.-Dionysius repeats the same order in EH III, 8.[93]

[91] ST 145:528; trans. adapted from MINGANA 94.

[92] PG 3:425CD. Trans. adapted from DIONYSIUS THE PSEUDO-AREOPAGITE, *The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, trans. T.L. CAMPBELL (Lanham, MD/New York/London 1981) 35.

[93] PG 3:437A.

3. *The Synod of Mopsuestia in 550*

In 550, the acts of a local synod held in that same small diocese in Cilicia Secunda made famous by Theodore of Mopsuestia furnish the fullest extant details concerning the diptychs of the dead anywhere in Late Antiquity. The synod had been convoked to see whether the name of Theodore, bishop there in full communion with the Orthodox Church from 392 until his death in 428, be found written in the sacred diptychs of his Church, together with the other Catholic bishops of the city. Renowned among his contemporaries for learning and orthodoxy, Theodore was condemned as a heretic 125 years after his death, along with his (and Chrysostom's) teacher Diodore, later bishop of Tarsus (378-391/2), at the Synod of the Three Chapters or Fifth Ecumenical Council, Constantinople II, in 553.[94] From these synodal *Acta*, extant only in Latin, it is clear that the clergy and notables of Mopsuestia were subjected to a full-scale accounting:

> **16.** Sanctissimi episcopi dixerunt: Reuerentissimus sacrorum custos uasorum istius sanctissimae ecclesiae adferat ad considerationem nobis et recitationem huius sacra diptycha, in quibus sanctae memoriae sacerdotum istius optimae ciuitatis scripta continentur uocabula.
>
> **17.** Iohannes presbyter et cimiliarcha dixit: Secundum jussionem uestrae sanctitatis inter sacra uasa quae a me servantur, habentes diptycha ista protuli et ad recitationem porrigo. habeo autem et alios duo membraneos quaterniones ueteriores istis quae nunc sunt et recitantur; quos et ipsos protuli, sicut uidetis.
>
> **18.** Sanctissimi episcopi dixerunt: Ad auditum nostrae mediocritatis, sed etiam illorum qui ad te testimonium producti sunt reuerentissimi et clarissimi et honestissimi uiri, recitentur sacra diptycha quae declarant sanctae memoriae connumerationem sacerdotum istius Mopsuestenae ciuitatis, ex quo immaculata et orthodoxa fides praedicatur usque ad hunc sacerdotem qui in praesenti tertia decima indictione defunctus est.
>
> **19.** Et recitati sunt et habent sic
>
> Pro requiescentibus episcopis Protegene, Zosimo, Olympio, Cyrillo, Thoma, Basiano, Iohanne, Auxentio, Palatino, Iacobo, Zosimo, Theodoro, Simeone.
>
> **20.** ITEM EX ALIO DIPTYCHO
>
> Pro requiescentibus episcopis Protegene, Zosimo, Olympio, Cyrillo, Thoma, Basiano, Iohanne, Auxentio, Palatino, Iacobo, Zosimo, Theodoro, Simeone.
>
> **21.** ET EX ALIIS DIPTYCHIS

[94] ACO IV.1-2.

Pro requiescentibus episcopis Protegene, Zosimo, Olympio, Cyrillo, Thoma, Basiano, Iohanne, Auxentio, Palatino, Iacobo, Theodoro, Simeone.

22. Sanctissimi episcopi dixerunt: Porrigantur etiam nobis ad recitationem et considerationem quae manifestata facta sunt sacra diptycha, ut uniusquisque nostrum ista perlegat et inspiciat.

23. Et porrecta sunt sanctissimis episcopis.

24. Sanctissimi episcopi dixerunt: Sunt etiam alia prolatis ueteriora apud tuam reuerentiam?

25. Iohannes presbyter et cimiliarcha dixit: Ista habeo, domini, quae et protuli.

26. Sanctissimi episcopi dixerunt: Propositis diuinis scripturis hoc ipsum explana.

27. Iohannes presbyter et cimiliarcha dixit: Per ipsam uirtutem, non habeo alia diptycha istis ueteriora, sed omnia quae habeo, protuli...[95]

Here we see not only all extant redactions of the Mopsuestian books being checked to see if Theodore's name is in the diptychs (**17-27**). Sworn depositions are also being taken as to actual past and present practice. The skeuophylax (*cimiliarcha* in the Latin version: **17, 25, 27**), head sacristan or custodian of the sacred vessels and other liturgical paraphernalia, at that time a presbyter named John, is summoned to show the books and read the lists (**17**). Not content with that, the examining bishops wish to read the lists for themselves (**18**), and John must even swear that he is not displaying "cooked" accounts: i.e., that there is not another, hidden set of books with the banished name (**24-27**).

Still not satisfied, the inquisitors hear the testimony of the older clergy, who all swear that within living memory they have never heard a whisper of Theodore of Mopsuestia's name in their diptychs. And "hear" is the right verb: from the expressions employed with regard to Theodore's name in the diptychs ("praedicatum, recitantes, praedicatione, praedicari, diptycha leguntur in diuino ministerio, praedicatur, recitari..."[96]) it is obvious that they were proclaimed aloud in church.

The diptychs and the sworn testimony of the witnesses reveal a Cyril and a Theodore named in the diptychs. The inquisitors want the elders' sworn testimony as to if and when Theodore of Mopsuestia's name was removed from the diptychs, and who took his place:

28 ....ad eandem autem iuramenti fidem respicientes etiam suam aetatem explanent et piissimi domini rerum iussionem sequentes dicant, si tempus

[95] ACO IV.1:121-2.

[96] Respectively, ACO IV.1:117.12, 30; 116.20; 122.9, 33, 35; 123.7, 34, 40.

sciunt et retinent, per quod Theodorus olim episcopus, factus istius ciuitatis sacrorum praedicatione diptychorum electus est, et quis illius in iisdem sacris diptychis locum subpleuit.[97]

The witnesses identify the Theodore named in the lists as a bishop of Mopsuestia who came from Galatia and had died three years before – hence not our Theodore.[98] Cyril is the famous Cyril of Alexandria. None of the witnesses know of a Cyril who had been bishop of Mopsuestia.[99] Some profess not to know how Cyril of Alexandria's name got into the Mopsuestian diptychs. Others had heard from their forebears ("ab antiquioribus, a senioribus") that Cyril's name had been substituted for Theodore's. From the tenor of the testimony it appears that the presence of Cyril's name among what some witnesses call the list of "the deceased bishops of our city,"[100] was a source of perplexity.

The testimony of the deacon Thomas, fifty-five years old and a member of the clergy since he was six,[101] is typical:

42. Thomas diaconus dixit: Per istas sanctas scripturas ueritatem dico. quinquaginta quinque annorum sum, quadraginta nouem autem habeo annos in clero et non scio neque audiui inscriptum esse sacris diptychis uel recitari eum qui olim fuit nostrae ciuitatis episcopus Theodorus. audiui autem a senioribus hominibus quod beatus Cyrillus pro ipso insertus est Alexandrinae ciuitatis pontifex, qui et usque nunc recitatur in sacris diptychis cum requiescentibus episcopis nostrae ciuitatis. Cyrillum autem episcopum fuisse in nostra ciuitate nescio neque audiui. iste autem qui nunc recitatur in sacris diptychis Theodorus, ante tres annos mortuus, de Galatia erat.[102]

[97] *Ibid.* 122.

[98] *Ibid.* 122-8. For the episcopal lists of Mopsuestia, see FEDALTO II, 770-2.

[99] ACO *loc. cit.* FEDALTO II, 771 mistakenly lists this Cyril as a bishop of Mopsuestia. He is obviously Cyril of Alexandria.

[100] Thomas presbyter: **36.**"cum requiescentibus sacerdotibus nostrae ciuitatis" (ACO IV.1:124); Iohannes diaconus: **43.**"in diptychis in connumeratione requiescentium episcoporum nostrae ciuitatis" (*ibid.* 125).

[101] The ordination of young boys is common even today in the Middle East, where, for instance, in the Chaldean Catholic Church or the Assyrian Church of the East, boys are ordained to minor orders at a tender age and sing the offices in Syriac by heart in church. After they marry, many of them are ordained deacons and serve at the liturgy while continuing to earn their livelihood at a secular trade or profession, and, of course, some go on to the presbyterate.

[102] ACO IV.1:125.

Following him, deacon John also speaks of Cyril's name in *their* list:

> **43.** ...scio autem praedicari in diptychis in connumeratione requiescentium episcoporum nostrae ciuitatis Cyrillum pontificem Alexandriae.[103]

The deacon Paul says the same,[104] as does one of the lay witnesses, the prefect (praefectianus) Stephen:

> **49.** audiui autem in connumeratione episcoporum nostrae ciuitatis praedicari Cyrillum qui, sicut dicebant seniores, fuit episcopus Alexandriae magnae ciuitatis, qui et usque nunc cum requiescentibus episcopis nostrae Mopsuestenae ciuitatis recitatur.[105]

Now from all this it is obvious that these diptychs have become fully hierarchical, comprising the officially approved list of those local hierarchs recognized as orthodox and legitimate successors of the apostles. As such, the diptychs were a major ecclesiological issue, and who was or was not to be named in them was kept under strict canonical control. It is equally obvious that the Mopsuestian diptychs were meant to include the names of all the deceased bishops of the see of Mopsuestia – and of that see only. The presence of Cyril of Alexandria's name in the list was an anomoly. It had been added in place of Theodore's after the Council of Ephesus in 431, for obvious reasons.

This is noteworthy because it provides our earliest evidence of the shift, clearly observable in the later diptychs of the non-Chalcedonian Churches, from purely *local diptychs*, listing only the bishops of the local eparchy, to *confessional diptychs*, local lists that begin to be filled out with names of some foreign heroes of the confessional communion or federation of Churches we know as Oriental Orthodox, comprising the Armenian, Syro-Jacobite, Coptic, and Ethiopian Orthodox Churches.

But apart from that exception, it seems that the local Church of Mopsuestia in this period evinced no concern to express in its diptychs bonds of ecclesial communion outside its own ambience. Its diptychs of the dead were purely *local hierarchical* commemorations, and had nothing to do with communion with anyone else.

[103] *Loc. cit.*
[104] *Loc. cit.* no. **44.**
[105] *Ibid.* 126.

VI. West-Syrian Mesopotamia

1. *Jacob of Sarug*

Not far from Mopsuestia a quarter of a century earlier we have the witness of the prolific Syriac writer Jacob of Sarug (451-521), periodeutes (visitor or chorbishop[106]) of Haura (Tell Abiad?) and, at the end of his life (519-521), bishop of Baṭnān d-Sarūg (Βάτναι), a suffragan see of Edessa in the Province of Osrhoëne in Mesopotamia – modern Sürüç in Turkey, southwest of Edessa (Urfa) and just north of the Turkish-Syrian border. Jacob is one of the post-Chalcedonian Syriac Fathers whose orthodoxy seems above suspicion: he is honored as a saint by the Catholic Maronites as well as by the non-Chalcedonian Jacobites and Armenians.[107] In his *Homily on the Memorial of the Dead and on the Eucharistic Bread and on the Fact that the Dead Profit by the Offerings and Alms Given for Them*,[108] Mar Jacob bitterly laments the dying out of the custom of bringing to the eucharist offerings of bread and wine in memory of the dead:

> 1. Bring bread and wine and love to the place of atonement, that with thy memorial the priest may enter in before the Majesty. 2. On the stones of the ephod Moses wrote the names of the tribes, that the priest might bring in the memorials of them to the holy of holies. And thou, on the eucharistic bread inscribe thy memorial and that of thy departed ones, and give it to the priest to offer before God... Give to God his name and his memorial with thy oblation... Here [in the church] are set forth their memorials and their names in the great book of the Godhead, wherein is every one of them...[109]
>
> 3. On behalf of the souls of the dead the priest enters in and stands and

[106] Χωρεπίσκοποι, "country bishops" – from the Greek χώρα, the countryside, a country place, village, estate, any inhabited locale that is not a city (πόλις), as in Byzantine litanic petitions "For this city and for every city and country place (χώρας)..." (LEW 363.10-12) – were auxiliaries of the local hierarch, leading presbyters charged with ministering to the needs of the Christian communities in the countryside surrounding the diocesan seat. Though they were granted certain faculties and privileges not shared by ordinary presbyters, it does not seem that they had episcopal orders.

[107] On Jacob, his see, and further literature on his orthodoxy, cf. HINDO, *Appendice* I, 457-9; HONIGMANN 52-3; FEDALTO II, 808-9; URBINA 104-9.

[108] Ed. BEDJAN I, 535-50; English trans. CONNOLLY, "Homily on the Memorial."

[109] CONNOLLY, "Homily on the Memorial," 264-5.

sets the bread and wine of the sacrament upon the table; **4.** and the death of Jesus he commemorates there, likewise his resurrection. **5.** And every one that is departed he calls to the sacrifice to be pardoned; **6.** and all who offered and brought the eucharistic bread he commemorates with love. **7.** And for a memorial of their departed he signs the Mystery; and on behalf of all the dead who have fallen asleep he offers up the sacrifices. **8.** He calls to the Father and reminds Him of the death of His Son; **9.** and the Spirit sets forth and comes down and dwells on the oblation...

10. So also believing heirs of a dead man departed bring bread and wine in his name to the holy altar; and prayer of the priest and people is made over the departed; and the Lord pardons the dead man whose commemoration they are making... **11.** The faith of the Church is this, good friends, that she is able to make the bread and wine the Body and the Blood. **12.** She breaks the bread, and she knows it not for bread, but the Body; **13.** and she mingles the wine, and affirms that it is Blood in her vessel. **14.** And she reads the names of all her dead over the oblation, and she mingles them with her in the spiritual sacrifices.[110]

The homilist is obviously describing the anaphora, during which the priest commemorates the dead. Mention is made of the presentation of the gifts by the people before the liturgy (**1, 10**);[111] the recording of the names (**2**); the preanaphoral transfer and deposition of the gifts (**1, 3**);[112] the anaphora with its account of the economy (**4**), consecration (**7, 11**), anamnesis (**8**), and epiclesis (**9**), an oblation which is offered for the dead (**5, 7**), and during which the offerers are also commemorated (**6**). Over the oblation – i.e., undoubtedly after the consecration – the names of the dead are read (**14**), and perhaps of the offerers (**6**) too. But it is not altogether clear if these names are diaconal diptychs proclaimed aloud during the priest's anaphoral prayer, since the passage is speaking chiefly of that prayer itself. At any rate, another homily of the same author also shows that there were petitions within the anaphora,[113] and here, too, it is obvious that the names are read after the consecration, as in all sources for the Syro-Jacobite liturgy outside the Maphrianate of Tikrit in Mesopotamia[114] (though Mar Jacob was a Mesopotamian, he was neither a Nestorian nor a Maphrianate Jacobite).

[110] *Ibid.* 267-8.

[111] On this practice, see TAFT, *Great Entrance* 12-34.

[112] See *ibid.* 35-51.

[113] CONNOLLY, "Homily on the Mysteries," 283-4 = BEDJAN III, 660-2.

[114] Modern Tagrit in Iraq, on the Tigris between Baghdad and Mosul. The Maphrianate was an autonomous branch of the Jacobite Church with its own local Jacobite rite with distinctive traits, one of which was to imitate the Nesto-

From the author's long concluding plaidoyer defending the idea that the dead profit from the oblations and prayers offered for them at the eucharist,[115] it is clear that the issue remained a problem long after Cyril of Jerusalem and Chrysostom sought to justify it.

2. *The Canons of Marutha*

A collection of Pseudo-Nicene canons in Syriac are ascribed to a Mesopotamian Syriac Father from the pre-Nestorian period, St. Marutha,[116] from before 399 until his death ca. 418/20 bishop of Maipherqat (Arabic Mayyâfâriqîn) within the Patriarchate of Antioch, the ancient city of Tigranokerta, later, in the Christian era, Martyropolis in Sophene (Sophanene) in the Province of Mesopotamia Prima, now in eastern Turkey not far from the source of the Tigris, about seventy kilometers northeast of the metropolitan see of Amida.[117] Canon 30 says this of the diptychs:

> **1**. *About this, that (the name of) the patriarch shall be proclaimed.* **2**. It is the will of the general synod that at all times of the service, (the name) of the bishop shall be proclaimed.
>
> **3**. But on Sunday and on the festivals, the deacon shall remember in his proclamation at the altar the patriarch, the metropolitans, and the archdeacons and the chorepiscopus. **4**. For it is right that at these holy days (the names) of the leaders of the church (shall be proclaimed) at the altar. **5**. For through them every ecclesiastical order shall be completed and fulfilled.[118]

This text is obviously dealing with the diptychs, since it is the deacon who proclaims the commemoration of the hierarchs (3). Here for the first time we see a clear distinction made between the day-to-day

rian preanaphoral diptychs. The Maphrianate and its diptychs are discussed in chapter III, section C.I.2.

[115] CONNOLLY, "Homily on the Memorial," 268-70 = BEDJAN I, 546-8.

[116] On Marutha, see URBINA 51-5; E. TISSERANT, "Marouta de Maypherqat (saint)," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* X.1:142-9.

[117] On the Maipherqat diocese, see FEDALTO II, 848; HINDO, *Appendice* I, 498-9.

[118] A. VÖÖBUS, *The Canons ascribed to Maruta of Maipherqat and Related Sources* (CSCO 439-440 = scr. Syri 191-192, Louvain 1982) Syriac 439/191:39; version 440/192:67-8; O. BRAUN, *De sancta Nicaena synodo. Syrische Texte des Maruta von Maipherkat nach einer Handschrift der Propaganda zu Rom* (Kirchengeschichtliche Studien, Bd. IV, Heft 3. Münster 1898) 81. On the disputed provenance of these canons, see VÖÖBUS, CSCO 440/192: V-X.

remembrance of the local hierarch in the diptychs (**2**), undoubtedly along with other communicants of the local congregation and their intentions, and fuller, formal, *hierarchical diptychs* for more solemn occasions (**3-4**), when the entire hierarchical ladder of the local communion, from the patriarch and metropolitans down to the local bishop and his chief diocesan officials (archdeacon, chorbishops[119]), are named (**3-4**), and, through them, implicitly, the whole Church (**5**).

Such developments are not surprising. After the Peace of Constantine in 312, church organization gradually solidified, and intermediate structures binding the local Churches into larger administrative units – metropolitan provinces, patriarchates – emerge. Furthermore, schisms and doctrinal crises make tests of jursidictional loyalty and confessional orthodoxy imperative: the introduction of the creed into the eucharistic liturgy at the beginning of the sixth century, in the fallout of the Monophysite crisis, is an instance of the latter.[120] The greater formalizing and "officialization" of the diptychs from the second half of the fourth century is undoubtedly attributable to such factors.

VII. East-Syrian Mesopotamia

1. *Narsai*

The Nestorian writer Narsai († 502) gives in *Homily 17* precise liturgical information on the nature of the diptychal commemorations in the East-Syrian or Mesopotamian rite of the "Church of the East," centered around the Catholicosate of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, a twin-city whose ruins are still visible south of Baghdad in Iraq:

> While the Peace is being given in the Church from one to another, the Book of the two (sets of) names, of the living and dead, is read. The dead and the living the Church commemorates in that hour, that she may declare that the living and the dead are profited by the oblation. And the people add: "On behalf of all the Catholici"[121] – a prayer which follows upon that which has been recited in the reading of the book – "On behalf of all orders deceased from Holy Church, or for those who are deemed worthy of the reception of

[119] See note 106 above.

[120] See TAFT, *Great Entrance* 398-402.

[121] I.e. the chief hierarchs of the Mesopotamian Church, who bore the title Catholicos of Seleucia-Ctesiphon.

this oblation: on behalf of these and Thy servants in every place, receive, Lord, this oblation which Thy servant has offered."[122]

If we prescind from the different placement of the diptychs – here before the anaphora, there concomitant with the anaphoral intercessions – this would appear to say little more than what Chrysostom, *In Acta hom. 21*, 4, witnessed to in Constantinople.[123] Later sources analyzed in section C.I of the next chapter, however, will show that Narsai is referring to the lengthy Mesopotamian diptychs called *The Book of Life*. In fact the section he cites is simply the concluding, summary kārōzūṯā following the lengthy text of the diptychs in the redaction that has come down to us.[124] So it would appear that Mesopotamia, like Cilicia, had highly developed local hierarchical diptychs by the end of the fifth century.

2. *Gabriel of Basra*

Some such distinction between day-to-day and more official, festive diptychs, like the one just seen in the canons of Marutha treated in section C.VI.2 above, seems to have become long-standing Mesopotamian usage. At the end of the ninth century, the Nestorian metropolitan Gabriel of Basra, a port on the Shatt-al-Arab or confluence of the Tigris and Euphrates in southern Iraq, repeats the canon in his collection, prefacing it, however, with a gloss which modifies its bearing:

1. *Question 12*: Must one read the diptychs every Sunday, or only on feasts?

2. *Answer*: The diptychs consist in two books, that of the living, who are among us, and that of the dead. **3.** On feasts both must be read, **4.** on Sunday only those of the living, according to the general canon.[125]

Then "canon 3 of the 318 fathers of Nicea" is cited, though in actual fact it says something totally different from Gabriel's gloss, where it is no longer a question of everday *parochial diptychs* and festive *hierarchi-*

[122] CONNOLLY, *Narsai* 10.

[123] Cited at the very beginning of chapter IV.

[124] LEW 281.30-282.3 (the section of text in LEW 281.26-29 is out of place, and belongs before the diptychs, between LEW 275.5-6).

[125] H. KAUFHOLD, *Die Rechtssammlung des Gabriel von Basra und ihr Verhältnis zu den anderen juristischen Sammelwerken der Nestorianer* (Münchener Universitätsschriften – Juristischer Fakultät. Abhandlungen zur rechtswissenschaftlichen Grundlagensforschung, Bd. 21, Berlin 1976) 232-3.

cal diptychs, but of the *diptychs of the living* and those of the *dead* (**2**), with both read only on feasts (**3**), but on Sundays only those of the living (**4**).

Though this final document carries us way beyond the chronological limits of our study, the two Syriac canonical texts cited, the canons of Marutha and of Gabriel of Basra, are of interest in that they formalize two new developments in the diptychs:

1. a gradual shift away from the more locally focussed, *ad hoc* lists of the bishop and offerers of the local community and their intentions, to more official, hierarchical diptychs.
2. a concomitant shift from the everyday to the festive, as the use of the diptychs, once an integral part of every liturgy, becomes restricted to the proclamation of these more official and structured lists on solemn occasions.

CONCLUSION

From the first extant documents, none earlier than the second half of the fourth century, we can draw the following conclusions concerning the pristine diptychs in at least some areas of the Christian East:

1. The diptychs were not just general commemorations by category, but two lists of actual names of individual persons, one of the living and one of the dead.
2. The lists were selective: not every possible living and dead person was commemorated by name.
3. But all, even those not named, were considered included in the remembrance implicitly, and there may even have been a general concluding formula in that sense.
4. The lists were proclaimed by the deacon: at least that fact distinguished them clearly from the intercessions pronounced by the presider.
5. Concerning the place of the diptychs in the liturgy, we see two irreducible traditions from the start. In some areas they were proclaimed just before the preanaphoral dialogue. More usually, they accompanied the anaphoral intercessions of the presiding celebrant.
6. The care taken by several authors – Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Jacob of Sarug – to justify

commemorating the living and dead during the anaphora may signal innovations in this matter from the second half of the fourth century on.

7. This could reflect a struggle between two initial diptychal traditions: [1] one in which they were associated with the offering of prosphoras for the eucharist. The names of the offerers and of the persons for whom they offered were registered and proclaimed after the transfer of gifts, just before the anaphora; [2] the other in which the reading of the lists was concomitant with the anaphoral intercessions of the priest.
8. In some areas the diptychs were *parochial, variable, ad hoc* lists, commemorating the names of the (living) offerers, and of the living and dead for whom they offered, at each particular liturgy.
9. Elsewhere, the lists became largely, though perhaps not exclusively, *official, ecclesial, hierarchical, and fixed*: [1] the diptychs of the dead comprising the approved apostolic succession of the local Church, and already manifesting tendencies toward becoming *confessional* via the inclusion of the names of prominent deceased hierarchs from other Churches of the same communion; [2] the diptychs of the living moving towards an expression of the entire hierarchical ladder of the local communion, from the patriarch and metropolitans down to the local authorities.
10. This shift toward more formalized, official diptychs from the end of the fourth century was probably stimulated by the evolution of intermediate administrative divisions within the Church, as well as provoked by schisms and doctrinal crises.
11. Liturgically, this development will entail a more restricted use of the diptychs, at least of the formal, "official" lists: they are proclaimed only on solemn occasions, no longer every day.
12. Such official, *hierarchical* or *confessional diptychs* for festive use, perhaps coexisted for a time with the everyday local *parochial diptychs*, but eventually the former will supplant the latter entirely.

What we have not yet seen is what will become most important later in East-West ecclesial relations: *communion diptychs* of the Byzantine variety, naming the chief hierarchs of the pentarchy in communion with one another. For that, keep on reading.

CHAPTER III

THE DIPTYCHS BEYOND BYZANTIUM

It is not my intention in this monograph to research the unpublished primary sources of liturgical traditions other than the Byzantine, or to do a thorough study of the diptychs in rites other than that of Constantinople. Still, a brief review of what the available evidence tells us about the diptychs in the non-Byzantine East will give us a better idea of this liturgical unit as it ultimately developed out of the early sources reviewed in chapter II, and provide a comparative framework for interpreting the Byzantine sources. It will also allow me, in the conclusion, to formulate a taxonomy of eastern liturgical diptychs that will set in relief the Byzantine diptychs and their distinctive characteristics by comparison with the same liturgical unit elsewhere.

A. PALESTINE

I. The Hagiopolite Diptychs in Codex Sinai Gr. 1040

The earliest liturgical source providing an actual Greek text of the diptychs of both the living and the dead from one of the Orthodox Patriarchates within the area of the Byzantine Empire and cultural sphere, is the twelfth-century Palestinian codex *Sinai Gr. 1040* (f. 45v), one of the very few extant Greek mss of the diakonikon, the liturgical book containing the diakonika or litanies and other exclamations proclaimed by the deacon.[1] The ms was probably copied at the Monastery

[1] DMITR II, 127-35 gives a description, with the edition of some pieces, including the diptychs of CHR; the diptychs of JAS are edited, and the persons named identified, in LEW 501-2. A similar, though more byzantinized, text of the diptychs

of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai, and was certainly for use within the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, since the diptychs commemorate first the patriarch of that lowest-ranking see of the pentarchy. It contains the diakonika not only for JAS (ff. 1-18), but also for "The Presanctified Liturgy of Saint James" (ff. 19-31), for CHR (ff. 32-51), and for BAS (ff. 52v-69), including the diptychs of the living for CHR, and of the living and dead for JAS. From the names commemorated, the text can be dated to ca. 1166. The diptychs of the living of JAS (**2**) name Patriarch Luke Chrysoberges of Constantinople (1157-1170), Sophronius II, pope of Alexandria before and during 1166, Patriarch Athanasius of Antioch (1157-1171), and Nicephorus II, patriarch of Jerusalem from before March 2, 1166, until some time after July 2, 1171. The latest emperor commemorated in the diptychs of the dead of JAS (**12**) is John II Comnenus (1118-1143).[2] And the diptychs of the living for CHR name as reigning sovereigns Emperor Manuel I Comnenus (1143-1180) and his consort Mary. After the patriarchs, the diptychs of JAS (**2**) name an unknown local diocesan archbishop Peter, undoubtedly of Pharan (Sinai).[3] Here is the text:

1. Ὁ ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς διάκονος...
τὰ δίπτυχα τῶν ζώντων.

2. Ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας εἰρήνης ἐλέους ἀγάπης διαμονῆς καὶ ἀντιλήψεως τοῦ ἁγίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Νικηφόρου τοῦ πατριάρχου Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ ἁγίων μεγάλων οἰκουμενικῶν ὀρθοδόξων τριῶν πατριαρχῶν Λουκᾶ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, Σωφρονίου Ἀλεξασνδρείας, Ἀθανασίου Ἀντιοχείας, Πέτρου τε τοῦ πανοσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ ἀρχιεπισκόπου καὶ λοιπῶν ὁσίων πατέρων καὶ ἐπισκόπων τῶν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὀρθοδόξως ὀρθοτομούντων τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας, παντὸς ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ ὀρθοδόξου τάγματος.

3.Καὶ ὑπὲρ βασιλέων καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ καὶ ἐξουσίᾳ ὄντων ἵνα ἤρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγωμεν ἐν πάσῃ εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ σεμνότητι.

of the living of JAS (nos. **2-4, 14** in the text below) is found in the 14th c. codex *Sinai Gr. 1039* ff. 53r-v, 71r-v.

[2] Not his predecessor Alexius I Comnenus (1081-1118), as Brightman says in LEW 501. On this and the other personages in this list, see chapter VI, section A.II.2.

[3] Fedalto II, 1044, does not list him for Pharan, nor is there listed any other Peter in dioceses of the Jerusalem patriarchate who fits this date (*ibid.* II, 1014-46).

4.Ἔτι ὑπὲρ πρεσβυτέρων διακόνων διακονισσῶν ὑποδιακόνων ἀναγνωστῶν ἑρμηνευτῶν ἐπορκιστῶν ψαλτῶν μοναζόντων ἀειπαρθένων χηρῶν ὀρφανῶν ἐγκρατευομένων καὶ τῶν ἐν σεμνῷ γάμῳ διαγόντων καὶ τῶν φιλοχρίστων.

5. Εἶτα ὁ ἐξ ἀριστερῶν διάκονος τὰ δίπτυχα τῶν κεκοιμημένων.

6.Τῆς παναγίας καὶ ὑπερευλογημένης δεσποίνης ἡμῶν θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας, τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἐνδόξου προφήτου προδρόμου καὶ βαπτιστοῦ· τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων Πέτρου Παύλου Ἀνδρέου Ἰακώβου Ἰωάννου Φιλίππου Βαρθολομαίου θωμᾶ Ματθαίου Ἰακώβου Σίμωνος Ἰούδα Ματθία· Μάρκου Λουκᾶ τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν· τῶν ἁγίων προφήτων καὶ πατριαρχῶν καὶ δικαίων· τοῦ ἁγίου Στεφάνου τοῦ πρωτοδιακόνου καὶ πρωτομάρτυρος· τῶν ἁγίων μαρτύρων καὶ ὁμολογητῶν τῶν διὰ Χριστὸν τὸν ἀληθινὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν μαρτυρησάντων καὶ ὁμολογεσάντων τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν.

7.Τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῶν καὶ ἀρχιεπισκόπων τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰακώβου τοῦ ἀποστόλου καὶ ἀδελφοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ πρώτου τῶν ἀρχιεπισκόπων μέχρι Εὐθυμίου Συμεὼν καὶ Ἰωάννου ταύτης τῆς ἁγίας τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν πόλεως.

8.Τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῶν καὶ διδασκάλων Κλήμεντος Τιμοθέου Ἰγνατίου Διονυσίου Διονυσίου Νικολάου Εἰρηναίου Γρηγορίου Ἀλεξάνδρου Εὐσταθίου Ἀθανασίου Βασιλείου Γρηγορίου Γρηγορίου Ἀμβροσίου Ἀμφιλοχίου Τιβερίου Δαμάσου Ἰωάννου Ἐπιφανίου θεοφίλου Κελευστίνου Αὐγουστίνου Κυρίλλου Λέοντος Πρόκλου Φίλικος Ὁρμίσδου Εὐφραϊμίου Μαρτίνου Ἀγάθωνος Σωφρονίου.

9.Καὶ τῶν ἁγίων μεγάλων ἑπτὰ Συνόδων τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ τριακοσίων δέκα ὀκτὼ καὶ τῶν ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τὸ πρότερον διακοσίων καὶ τῶν ἐν Καλχηδόνι ἑξακοσίων τριάκοντα καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ πέμπτῃ συνόδῳ ἑκατὸν ἑξήκοντα τεσσάρων καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ ἕκτῃ συνόδῳ διακοσίων ὀγδοήκοντα ἐννέα καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ ἑβδόμῃ συνόδῳ τριακοσίων πεντήκοντα, καὶ λοιπῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῶν καὶ ἐπισκόπων τῶν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὀρθοδόξως ὀρθοτομησάντων τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας.

10.Τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῶν καὶ ἀσκητῶν Παύλου Ἀντωνίου Παύλου Παχωμίου Ἀμμωνᾶ θεοδώρου Ἰλαρίωνος Ἀρσενίου Μακαρίου Ἰωάννου Εὐφραίμ Ὀνουφρίου Συμεῶνος Συμεῶνος θεοδοσίου Σαβᾶ Χαρίτωνος Εὐθυμίου Γερασίμου Μαξίμου Ἀναστασίου Κοσμᾶ Ἰωάννου, καὶ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῶν ἀναιρεθέντων ὑπὸ τῶν Βαρβάρων ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ὄρει τῷ Σινᾶ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ῥαΐθῳ.

11.Ἔτι ὑπὲρ πρεσβυτέρων διακόνων διακονισσῶν ὑποδιακόνων ἀναγνωστῶν ἑρμηνευτῶν ἐπορκιστῶν ψαλτῶν μοναζόντων τῶν μετὰ πίστεως ἐν τῇ κοινωνίᾳ τῆς ἁγίας σου καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τελειωθέντων.

12.Καὶ τῶν εὐσεβῶν καὶ πιστῶν βασιλέων Κωνσταντίνου Ἑλένης, θεοδοσίου τοῦ μεγάλου, Μαρκιανοῦ Βασιλείου Κωνσταντίνου Ῥωμανοῦ, Μιχαὴλ μοναχοῦ, Ἰωάννου καὶ Εἰρήνης, Ἀλεξίου καὶ Εἰρήνης καὶ τῶν κατ' αὐτοὺς εὐσεβῶς καὶ πιστῶς βασιλευσάντων καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν πίστει καὶ σφραγῖδι Χριστοῦ προκεκοιμημένων φιλοχρίστων ὀρθοδόξων λαϊκῶν.

13.Καὶ πάλιν ὁ ἐκ δεξιῶν διάκονος λέγει·

14.Και ὑπὲρ εἰρήνης καὶ εὐσταθείας τοῦ σύμπαντος κόσμου καὶ ἑνώσεως πασῶν τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ θεοῦ ὀρθοδόξων ἐκκλησιῶν καὶ ὑπὲρ ὧν ἕκαστος προσήνεγκεν ἢ κατὰ διάνοιαν ἔχει καὶ τοῦ περιεστῶτος φιλοχρίστου λαοῦ καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.

15.Ὁ λαός· Καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.[4]

The same basic redaction is found in the unedited fourteenth-century text of Greek JAS in codex *Sinai Gr. 1039* (f. 71r-v): there are more variants in the diptychs of the living, ff. 53r-55r, but the tradition in the two mss is substantially the same.

How these lists, which have the diptychs of the dead inserted within a framework that begins and ends with commemorations of the living, were actually employed, one can deduce from the mss of JAS, beginning with the earliest, the ninth-century codex *Vatican Gr. 2282.*[5] A rubric, located just before the priest's ekphonesis commemorating the Theotokos (Εξαιρέτως...)[6] refers only to the diptychs of the living, and the two mss which actually give the diptychal text following this rubric, place here sections **2-4** of the text above. The final piece, when the diptychs return to the living (section **14** above), is located, as in Constantinopolitan usage, after the priest's ekphonesis for the hierarchy (Εν πρώτοις...) – in this case commemorating all the patriarchs.[7] Though only two mss have a rubric to indicate it,[8] it is obvious from their incipit that the diptychs of the dead in sections **6-12** were to be placed after the Ἐξαιρέτως ekphonesis commemorating the Theotokos.

In this text we see that the hagiopolite lists open with the diptychs of the living (**1-4**), pass to those of the dead (**5-12**), then return to conclude with a general commemoration of the dead (**12**) and the living

[4] LEW 501-3.
[5] PO 26.2:212-20.
[6] PO 26.2:214.10-11.
[7] PO 26.2:220.
[8] PO 26.2:214, apparatus 14.

(13-14) and everyone **(15)**, very much like what we shall see in the Armenian and East-Syrian liturgies examined below in sections B.I and C.I of this chapter. I suspect that both the presider's exclamations (Ἐξαιρέτως/ Ἐν πρώτοις) that now punctuate the lists in the extant medieval redaction of JAS, are Byzantine imports.

II. The Metrical Diptychs of Codex Sabas 153

There is also a set of metrical diptychs, equally hagiopolite, in codex *Sabas 153*.[9] I have no idea if or how these metrical diptychs were meant to be employed. I suspect they are just a literary device not intended for liturgical use.

III. Conclusion A: the Palestinian Diptychs of St. James

It would seem that the original Jersualem diptychs comprised one unified text in which the diptychs of the dead followed those of the living, just as in the East-Syrian tradition today.[10]

Note too that the hagiopolite diptychs of the dead follow the same tradition as the Armenian, West-Syrian, Mesopotamian, Egyptian, and Ethiopian diptychs, as we shall see in the following sections of this chapter. They include the commemoration of the Mother of God and John the Baptist, plus a list of saints – in the hagiopolite diptychs a relatively long list, divided into categories, some of them filled out with lists of names: apostles, evangelists, martyrs, confessors, archbishops of Jerusalem, fathers and teachers, council fathers, ascetics. Then comes the general remembrance, without names, of the lesser clergy, from presbyters on down; and, finally, the laity, beginning with the sovereigns, of whom Constantine and Helena, Theodosius the Great, Marcian, Basil, Constantine, Romanus, Michael the monk, John and Irene, Alexis and Irene are mentioned by name;[11] and ending with the general

[9] A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας* I (St. Petersburg 1891) 124-126. On this text see G. Every, "Syrian Christians in Jerusalem, 1183-1283," *Eastern Churches Quarterly* 7 (1947-1948) 50-1.

[10] See section C.I of this chapter below.

[11] On these personages, see chapter VI, section A.II.2.

remembrance of all deceased Orthodox laity. After all this the text returns to the living, concluding with a general formula remembering them.

B. THE ARMENIAN DIPTYCHS

I. The Patarag

Closely related in some ways to the Palestinian tradition represented by JAS are the diptychs of the Armenian mass or *Patarag*.[12] The Armenian anaphora follows the traditional Antiochene shape, with the anaphoral intercessions flowing from the epiclesis, which comes after the words of institution, anamnesis, and oblation.[13] The diptychs, in turn, accompany the intercessions. The text reads as follows.[14] The ellipses indicate the customary conclusion to the petition, or a continuing list of saints' names which need not be given in full here. The response [2] remains the same except for the variant indicated for Sundays and dominical feasts [5]:

[1] *Priest*: Of the Mother of God the holy virgin Mary and of John the Baptist, of the protomartyr Stephen and of all the saints, to be mindful in this holy sacrifice, we beseech the Lord.

[2] *Response*: Be mindful, Lord, and have mercy.

[3] *The deacon, at the right of the altar*: Of the holy apostles, the prophets, doctors, martyrs and of all the holy patriarchs, apostolic bishops, presbyters, orthodox deacons and of all the saints, to be mindful in this holy sacrifice, we beseech the Lord.

([4] *Deacon, on Sundays and feast of the Lord*: The blessed, praised, glorified, marvellous and divine resurrection [or other mystery] of Christ, we worship.

[5] *Response*: Glory to your resurrection [or other mystery], O Lord.

[12] There is as yet no scholarly study of the Armenian eucharistic liturgy available. The best general introduction to this liturgical tradition, with ample further bibliography, is found in G. WINKLER, *Das armenische Initiationsrituale. Entwicklungsgeschichtliche und liturgievergleichende Untersuchung der Quellen des 3. bis 10. Jahrhunderts* (OCA 217, Rome 1982) 15-101.

[13] LEW 437-9.

[14] *Pataraganatoyc'. Divine Liturgy of the Armenian Apostolic Orthodox Church* (New York 1950) 74-9; LEW 440.12-443.33.

[6] *Deacon, on saints' days*: Of the holy and god-pleasing prophet/patriarch/apostle/martyr NN. whose commemoration we have made this day, to be mindful in this holy sacrifice, we beseech the Lord.)

[7] *Deacon*: Of our leaders and first enlighteners, the holy apostles Thaddeus and Bartholomew, and of Gregory the Illuminator, of Aristakes...and of all the pastors and chief pastors of Armenia, to be mindful...

[8] Of the holy anchorites, the virtuous and God-instructed monks Paul, Anthony...and of all the holy fathers and of their disciples throughout the world, to be mindful...

[9] Of the Christian kings, the saints Abgarius, Constantine, Tiridates and of Theodosius, and of all the holy and pious kings and God-fearing princes, to be mindful...

[10] Of the faithful everywhere, of men and women, old and young, and of all those of every age who in faith and holiness have fallen asleep in Christ, to be mindful...

[11] *Priest*: And especially grant us to have our chief bishop and venerable patriarch of all Armenians, the Lord N., for length of days in orthodox doctrine.

[12] *The deacon, now at the left of the altar*: Thanksgiving and glory we offer unto you, O Lord, for this holy and immortal sacrifice which is on this holy table, that you will vouchsafe it to be for holiness of life unto us. Through this grant love, stability and the desirable peace to the whole world, to the holy Church and to all orthodox bishops, and to our chief bishop and venerable patriarch of all Armenians, Lord N., and to the priest who offers this sacrifice.

[13] Let us pray for the armies, and for the victory of Christian kings and pious princes.

[14] Let us also beseech the Lord for the souls of them that are at rest, and moreover for our prelates that are at rest, and for the founders of this holy church, and for them that are at rest under its shadow.

[15] Let us ask deliverance for those of our brethren that are captive, and grace upon the congregation here present, and rest for them that have died in Christ with faith and holiness. Of these to be mindful...

[16] *Response*: For all and for the sake of all.

The dependence of this text on both the Byzantine diptychs and JAS is revealed by the following:

1. The Armenian diptychs have a structure similar to the Byzantine, with each unit of diptychs, for the dead and the living, opening with an

exclamation of the presiding celebrant [**1, 11**] to introduce the diaconal proclamation or *xoroc'*.[15]

2. The order of the diptychal intercessions, first for the dead [**1-10**], then for the living [**11-13**], then again for the dead and the living [**14-15**] and everyone [**16**], betrays a twofold foreign influence:

   [a] First, undoubtedly a Byzantine influence in the order of the diptychal commemorations, because to remember the dead before the living is Byzantine, and certainly not native to the Armenian liturgy, for it violates the order of the concomitant Armenian anaphoral intercessions, which, like those of JAS,[16] pray for the living, then for the dead, and then return to the living and dead for whom prayers have been requested.[17]

   [b] Second, that very return, by way of conclusion, to remember again the living and dead, betrays the influence of the intercessions/diptychs of JAS. For like the Armenian diptychs/intercessions, and unlike the Byzantine, the intercessions/diptychs of JAS also return at the end to commemorate once more all the living and dead.[18]
3. The influence of JAS is also evident in the respective rubrics for the deacon on the right [**3**] and left [**12**] of the altar.[19]
4. The concluding response [**16**] is simply a translation of the Greek καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν found, as we have seen, in CHR/BAS, and also, as here, at the end of the diptychs of JAS.[20]

Since the influence of the rite of Jerusalem was preponderant in the early development of the Armenian liturgy, and later Byzantine influence on the Armenian liturgy has been abundantly demonstrated, none of this is a source of wonder.[21]

[15] From the Syriac kārōzūṯā, a derivative of κήρυξ.

[16] PO 26.2:206.25-220.17 = PE 250-61.

[17] The intercessions of the living: LEW 439.27-440.5, 442.35 (right column)-443.13; those of the departed: LEW 443.14-28; those for whom prayers have been requested: LEW 443.29-37.

[18] See nos. **14-15** of the Greek text of the diptychs of JAS in section A.1 above, and PO 26.2:220 = PE 258-61.

[19] Cf. diptychs of JAS above, section A.1, nos. **1, 5**.

[20] *Ibid.* no. **15**.

[21] See esp. A. (C.) Renoux, *Le codex arménien Jérusalem 121*, I (PO 35.1, Turnhout 1969), II (PO 36.2, Turnhout 1971); G. Winkler, "Zur Geschichte des armenischen Gottesdienstes im Hinblick auf den in mehreren Wellen erfolgten griechischen Einfluß," OC 58 (1974) 154-172; id., "The Armenian Night Office II: The Unit of Psalmody, Canticles, and Hymns with Particular Emphasis on the Origins and Early Evolution of Armenia's Hymnography," *Revue des études armé-*

II. The Armenian Liturgical Commentators

From what one can glean from their general description of the diptychs, the Armenian liturgical commentators show that the Armenian diptychs had reached their present form as early as the tenth century.[22]

1. *Xosrov Anjewac'i († ca. 965)*

The earliest extant Armenian description of the *Patarag* or eucharistic service is *A Commentary on the Prayers of the Oblation*, written ca. 950 by the Chalcedonian Chosroes the Great, a widower consecrated bishop of Anjewac'ik sometime before that date by Catholicos Ananias of Mokk'.[23] Xosrov, after describing the anaphoral intercessions recited by the presiding celebrant of the liturgy, comments:

> This same thing which the priest commemorates [silently], the deacon repeats aloud, saying at intervals each section. And to each section the congregation present at the mystery [responds] aloud: "Be mindful, O Lord, and have mercy."[24]

Xosrov goes on to say that in each category, some individuals are mentioned by name, while others are included in the general remembrance of the category.

2. *Nersēs Lambronac'i (1153/4-1198)*

The precocious St. Nersēs Lambronac'i – i.e., of Lambron (or Lampron), a fortress south of Tarsus in Cilicia – was ordained a presbyter when only sixteen, then archbishop of Tarsus in Cilicia at the age of twenty-two, and died in his forty-fourth year with a considerable literary production to his name.[25] Nerses dedicates chapter 57 of his *Com-*

niennes, new series 17 (1983) 471-551; ID., "Ungelöste Fragen im Zusammenhang mit den liturgischen Gebräuchen in Jerusalem," *Handes Amsorya* (1987) 303-315.

[22] Cf. LEW xcix-c.

[23] On Xosrov and his commentary, see S. SALAVILLE, "L'«Explication de la messe» de l'arménien Chosrov (950). Théologie et liturgie," EO 39 (1940-42) 349-82, here esp. 349-55, 373-8; INGLISIAN 185-6.

[24] CHOSROAE MAGNI episcopi monophysitici *Explicatio precum missae*, trans. P. VETTER (Freiburg B. 1858) 39; cf. 47; SALAVILLE, "Explication," 373-8.

[25] In addition to INGLISIAN 915, see further bibligraphy and biographical details in B. TALATINIAN, "Florilegio dall'opera *Spiegazione della Santa Messa* di Nerses

mentary on the Mystery of the Oblation to the diptychs, under the title: "What does it mean that now the deacon proclaims near the altar the memory of the names of the saints in the hearing of the people?"[26] Though the explanation that follows does not enlighten us further on the contents of the diptychs, this fits in perfectly well with what we find today.

3. *Yovhannēs Arčišec'i (13th c.)*

The thirteenth century commentary of John of Arjesh – Yovhannēs Arčišec'i – in codex *Paris Arm. 29* is just a compilation based on the earlier two commentaries of Xosrov and Nerses.[27] Its mention of the diaconal diptychs testifies to their continued use in the Middle Ages.[28]

III. Conclusion B: The Armenian Ditpychs

An analysis of the sources of the Armenian diptychs leads to the following conclusions:

1. The have existed in more or less their present form since the middle of the tenth century at least.
2. Certain aspects of their text and rubrics betray an unmistakable dependence on JAS.
3. Their order, with the diptychs of the dead preceding those of the living, violates the order of the anaphoral intercessions, and is undoubtedly the result of foreign, probably Byzantine influence.[29]
4. Like other diptychs of the non-Chalcedonian Churches, as we shall see in the following sections of this chapter, they comprise a series of diaconal exclamations that parallel and distill the

Lambronatzi, arcivescovo armeno di Tarso (1152-1198)," in G.C. Bottini (ed.), *Studia Hierosolymitana III. Nell'ottavo centenario francescano (1182-1192)* (Studia biblica francescana, collectio maior 30, Jerusalem 1982) 193-245.

[26] Srboyn Nersesi Lambronac'ioy Tarsoni episkoposi, *Xorhrdacawat' iwnk' i kargs ekelec'woy ew meknowt'iwn Xorhrdoy Pataragin* (Venice 1847) 417-21; Catergian-Dashian 519-56.

[27] LEW c.

[28] Catergian-Dashian 516; cf. 511-8 on this commentary.

[29] I discuss the order of the intercessions/diptychs in chapter VI below.

anaphoral intercessions they are obviously intended to accompany.

5. In line with those same sister traditions except the Coptic, the Armenian diptychs are more a commemoration of Mary and the saints than diptychal lists in the older, more traditional sense of the term.

Little more can be said on this topic until we have a thoroughgoing historico-critical study of the ms tradition and other sources of the Armenian *Patarag*.

C. SYRIA AND MESOPOTAMIA

I. The Diptychs of Mesopotamia and *The Book of Life*

1. *The Commentators*

In section C.VII.1 of the previous chapter, we saw that Narsai († 502) witnesses to the Mesopotamian diptychs as early as the end of the fifth century. Several later Syriac liturgical texts and commentaries of both the Mesopotamian Jacobite and Nestorian traditions describe, and some give the text of, a document called the *Book of Life*,[30] which we saw to be a redaction of the same diptychs Narsai refers to.

This *Book of Life* was read just before the anaphora at the traditional place of the diptychs, in the eucharist described by Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Hom. 15*, 43,[31] and Ps.-Dionysius, *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* III, 2 and 3:8-9,[32] as well as in Narsai and the later Nestorian sources[33] – but not in the western Jacobite rite, which has the diptychs in the anaphora, at the intercessions following the epiclesis.[34]

[30] On the title, see CONNOLLY, "The Book of Life," 592-93. The expression originates, obviously, in Ps 68(69):29: "Let them be blotted out of the book of the living; let them not be enrolled among the righteous."

[31] ST 145:527-29 cited above in chapter II, section C.V.1.

[32] PG 4:425CD (cited in chapter II, section C.V.2), 437AB.

[33] See the following section.

[34] See section C.II below.

2. *Later Mesopotamian Sources*

This *Book of Life* in the Jacobite redaction comprises lengthy diptychs for the dead, including Old Testament, New Testament, and later Christian saints, especially those of particular interest to the Jacobite tradition, as well as the first three ecumenical councils, recognized by that Church.[35] The Nestorian redaction, called the *Book of the Living and Dead*,[36] has a similar lengthy list of the saints and the dead, plus a commemoration of the Council of Nicea, prefaced with much shorter diptychs of the living.[37] The diptychs are followed by a diaconal kārōzūtā for all the dead and for the congregation of worshippers present at the liturgy.[38]

Connolly has shown that these are the traditional Nestorian diptychs, referred to first by Narsai († 502), then in the commentary of Gabriel Qatraya bar Lipah (ca. 615),[39] in the slightly later, related commentary of his contemporary Abraham bar Lipah,[40] and in the commentary of Ps.-George of Arbela (Erbil) from around the ninth century.[41]

These Nestorian diptychs of the dead were imitated by the Jacobites of the Maphrianate of Tikrit in Mesopotamia – modern Tagrit in Iraq, on the Tigris between Baghdad and Mosul. The Maphrianate was an autonomous division of the Syro-Jacobite Church with its own local government under the jurisdiction of the Maphrian of Tikrit, a sort of exarch or major archbishop. Liturgically, the churches of the Maphrianate followed a local Jacobite rite with distinctive traits, one of which

[35] The Jacobite redaction from codex *Vatican Syr. 39*, copied in AD 1648 for the Church of the Mother of God in Aleppo by order of the Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch Mar Simeon Ignatios, is edited and translated in CONNOLLY-CODRINGTON 112-27; trans. also in CONNOLLY, "The Book of Life," 585-8.

[36] On the name, see note 30 above, and FIEY, "Diptyques," 376-8.

[37] FIEY, "Diptyques;" S.P. BROCK, "The Nestorian Diptychs. A Further Manuscript," AB 89 (1971) 177-85; LEW 275.1-281.25. The text is misplaced in LEW. The pax should come before the diptychs, between lines 5-6 on p. 275.

[38] LEW 281.30-282.3.

[39] JAMMO, *La messe chaldéenne* 37-8.

[40] R.H. CONNOLLY (ed.), *Anonymi auctoris Expositio officiorum ecclesiae Georgio Arbelensi vulgo adscripta. Accedit Abrahae bar Lipheh Interpretatio officiorum* (CSCO 64, 71 [textus], 72, 76 [versio], scr. Syri 25/29, 28/32 = series 2, tom. 91-92, Rome-Paris-Leipzig 1941-1945) here 92: text 177; versio 163.

[41] *Ibid.* 92: text 43-5; versio 42-4.

was the Nestorian preanaphoral diptychs or *Book of Life.*[42] Among the Jacobite authors who mention *The Book of Life*, the first, George, "Bishop of the Arab Tribes" (*floruit* 687-724),[43] was a suffragan of the Maphrian,[44] and Moses bār Kēphā († 903), born in Balad, was later bishop of Mosul and for ten years visitator of Tikrit.[45] Both Bār Kēphā[46] and an earlier, anonymous Jacobite commentary, *The Breaking of the Eucharist*,[47] betray the Jacobite *Book of Life* as a foreign intrusion into the Syro-Antiochene rite with the information that it is read only on feasts of the Lord, and that when it is read, the usual West-Syrian diptychs of the dead in the anaphora are omitted.[48] The intrusion soon fell into disuse. The next Jacobite commentator in chronological order, Dionysius bār Ṣalībī († 1171), just repeats Bār Kēphā's comments, prefacing them with the observation: "Concerning the Book of Life. Nowadays the reading of it has ceased everywhere."[49]

3. *Maronite Šarar*

Finally, the ancient Maronite *Šarar* anaphora retains a "Book of Life" tradition of preanaphoral diptychs, after the *pax*, akin to the Mesopotamian usage of the Assyro-Chaldeans,[50] one more sign that the Maro-

[42] On the Maphrianate, see TAFT, "Bema," 354-5. To my bibliography in that study, add FIEY, "Diocèses;" also the more recent edition and study of the 9th c. Tikritan liturgical commentary of John, Metropolitan of Dara in Upper Mesopotamia: J. SADER (ed.), *Le "De oblatione" de Jean de Dara* (CSCO 308-309 = scr. Syri 132-133, Louvain 1970); ID., *Le lieu du culte de la messe syro-occidentale selon le "De oblatione" de Jean de Dara. Étude d'archéologie et de liturgie* (OCA 223, Rome 1983). John of Dara does not mention *The Book of Life*, however.

[43] CONNOLLY-CODRINGTON 20.

[44] TAFT, "Bema," 354; FIEY, "Diocèses," PDO 5 (1974) 362-72; HINDO, *Appendice* II, 518-21.

[45] CONNOLLY-CODRINGTON 41-2, 63-4; TAFT, "Bema," 354.

[46] CONNOLLY-CODRINGTON 63-4.

[47] Pertinent section edited and translated in CONNOLLY, "The Book of Life," 582-5, esp. 584.

[48] CONNOLLY, "The Book of Life," 588-94.

[49] H. LABOURT (ed.), *Expositio liturgiae* (CSCO 13-14, scr. Syri, series 2, tom. 93) text 40-1; versio 60; CONNOLLY, "The Book of Life," 585.

[50] J.-M. SAUGET (ed.), *Anaphora Syriaca Sancti Petri Apostoli Tertia*, AS II.3:290-93; French trans. M. HAYEK, *Liturgie Maronite. Histoire et textes eucharistiques* (Paris 1963) 304-5; cf. I.E. RAHMANI, *Les liturgies orientales et occidentales étudiées et comparées entre elles* (Beirut 1929) 172, 319. I owe these references to

nite tradition can no longer be viewed as simply a latinized variant of the West-Syrian Rite, as Macomber pointed out in a brief study that is yet to receive the attention it deserves.[51]

II. The Syro-Antiochene Diptychs

So the Syro-Jacobite commentators knew two varieties of diptychs, the preanaphoral ditpychs or *Book of Life* of the Mesopotamian Jacobites in the Maphrianate of Tikrit, and the customary anaphoral diptychs of the sort found in all other traditions originating in Syria or Palestine, accompanying the anaphoral intercessions recited by the priest after the epiclesis. These diaconal diptychs in SyrJAS soon evolved into what early became a common diptychal system in the non-Chalcedonian eucharistic liturgies: a series of diaconal koruz'woto or exclamations closely paralleling what the priest was reciting silently in the anaphoral intercessions. These Syro-Jacobite diptychs, in common with the Coptic and Armenian diptychs today, do little more than summarize aloud for the people what the priest is praying for quietly at greater length, as can be seen by comparing the following diakonika with the intercessions they accompany in the anaphora:

> *The Deacon*: Bless, O Lord.
>
> Let us pray and beseech our Lord God at this great and dread and holy moment for our fathers and rulers who are over us this day in this present life and tend and rule the holy churches of God: the venerable and most blessed Mar N. our patriarch, and for Mar N. our metropolitan with the rest of the metropolitans and venerable orthodox bishops, let us beseech the Lord.
>
> Again, then, we commemorate all our faithful brethren, true Christians who have beforehand bidden and charged our humility and our weakness to remember them in this hour and at this time, and for all who have been cast into all manner of grievous temptations, to take refuge in you, O Lord, the mighty God, and for their salvation and their visitation by you speedily, and for this city preserved of God and for the concord and advancement of the faithful inhabitants thereof, that they be exercised in virtue, let us beseech the Lord.

my student Fouad Soueif, a Maronite priest, who is writing his doctoral dissertation on the Maronite preanaphora under my direction.

[51] W.F. MACOMBER, "A Theory on the Origins of the Syrian, Maronite and Chaldean Rites," OCP 39 (1973) 235-242.

Again, then, we commemorate all faithful kings and true Christians who in the four quarters of this world have founded and established churches and monasteries of God, and for every Christian polity, the clergy and the faithful people, that they be exercised in virtue, let us beseech the Lord.

Again, then, we commemorate her who is to be called blessed and glorified of all generations of the earth, holy and blessed and ever-virgin, blessed Mother of God Mary. And with her also let us remember the prophets and apostles and evangelists and preachers and martyrs and confessors, and blessed John the Baptist, messenger and forerunner, and the holy and glorious Mar Stephen, chief of deacons and first of martyrs. Let us therefore remember together all the saints: let us beseech the Lord.

Again, then, we commemorate those who among the saints have beforehand fallen asleep in holiness, and are at rest, and have kept undefiled the apostolic faith and delivered it to us, and those of the three pious and holy ecumenical synods we proclaim, that is, of Nicea and of Constantinople and of Ephesus, and our glorious and Godbearing fathers and orthodox doctors James, the brother of our Lord, who was apostle, martyr, and archbishop, Ignatius and Dionysius, Athanasius, Basil, Gregory, Timothy, Eustathius, John, but above all Cyril, who was the tower of the truth, who expounded the incarnation of the Word of God, and Mar James and Mar Ephrem, eloquent mouths and pillars of our holy Church, and those also who before them, with them, and after them kept the one orthodox and uncorrupted faith and delivered it to us, let us beseech the Lord.

Again, then, we commemorate all the faithful departed who from this holy altar and this town and this place and from all places and quarters have departed, the departed who in the belief of the truth have beforehand fallen asleep and are at rest, and have attained unto you, O God, Lord of spirits and of all flesh. Let us pray and intercede and beseech Christ our God, who has received their souls and spirits unto himself, to vouchsafe them in his great mercies pardon of offences and remission of sins, and to bring us and them to his heavenly kingdom.

Together let us cry and say thrice, Kurillison Kurillison Kurillison.[52]

III. Conclusion C: The Diptychs in the Syriac Sources

We can conclude, then, that the Jacobite *Book of Life* is a Nestorian loan-piece not of Antiochene provenance, and that pristine Syro-Antiochene usage confirms the place of the "western" Jacobite diptychs in the anaphora. These western Jacobite diaconal exclamations, like those of the other non-Chalcedonian communions, show a clear move away from the older style namings to general commemorations which, like the frequent

[52] LEW 89-95.

diaconal litanies in the Byzantine system, and the the other diaconal koruz'woto of these liturgical systems, simply distill and announce to the people what the priest is praying for in the silent prayers.

D. THE DIPTYCHS IN EGYPT

Egyptian liturgical sources from the patristic period have been dealt with in chapter II, section C.I.1-3. Later Egyptian eucharistic liturgy in the sources from Late Antiquity through the medieval centuries, though hardly an overworked field of liturgiology, has been receiving more attention of late.[53] Especially noteworthy are the edition and commentary of the Kacmarcik Codex by W.F. Macomber and my colleague at the Pontifical Oriental Institute, Samir Khalil, S.J.;[54] the new edition of GREG by Albert Gerhards,[55] and of MK by the late Geoffrey Cuming in this same OCA

[53] Overview in E. HAMMERSCHMIDT, "Some Remarks on the History of, and Present State of Investigation into, the Coptic Liturgy," *Bulletin de la Société d'archéologie copte* 19 (1967-1968) 89-113 (cf. ALW 19 [1978] 206-7); and esp. H. QUECKE, "Zukunftschancen bei der Erforschung der koptischen Liturgie," in R. McL. WILSON (ed.), *The Future of Coptic Studies* (Leiden 1978) 164-196, esp. 169-80. For studies thereafter, see the excellent ongoing review of the relevant current literature appearing periodically in ALW: H. BRAKMANN and W. CRAMER, "Literaturberichte," ALW 19 (1978) 199-201; H. BRAKMANN, ALW 24 (1982) 390-1; 30 (1988) 353-8; also the full bibliography in the references in ID., "Zur Bedeutung des Sinaiticus graecus 2148 für die Geschichte der melchitischen Markos-Liturgie," *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 30 (1981) 239-248; ID., "Basileios-Liturgie," esp. 121-6. I am grateful to Herr Brakmann for providing me with offprints of his uniformly excellent publications.

[54] In chronological order: W.F. MACOMBER, "The Kacmarcik Codex. A 14th Century Greek-Arabic Manuscript of the Coptic Mass," Mus 88 (1975) 391-395; ID., "The Greek Text of the Coptic Mass and of the Anaphoras of Basil and Gregory according to the Kacmarcik Codex," OCP 43 (1977) 308-334; SAMIR KHALIL, "Le codex Kacmarcik et sa version arabe de la Liturgie alexandrine," OCP 44 (1978) 74-106 + 3 plates; ID., "La version arabe du Basile alexandrin (codex Kacmarcik," *ibid.* 342-390; W.F. MACOMBER, "The Anaphora of Saint Mark according to the Kacmarcik Codex," OCP 45 (1979) 75-98; SAMIR KHALIL, "La version arabe de la Liturgie alexandrine de saint Grégoire (codex Kacmarcik)," OCP 45 (1979) 308-358.

[55] GERHARDS.

series.[56] But there is still no modern survey to replace the outdated pioneering study of Theodor Schermann.[57]

Since this is not a branch of oriental liturgiology in which I have specialized, while we are awaiting further work in this area I shall offer here but a few observations on the Egyptian Greek liturgical texts listed in the literature as useful for our purposes here.

I. The Coptic Intercessions Today

In the presanctus of the present Coptic eucharist according to the Anaphora of St. Cyril (= MK) there is a series of brief diakonika, each beginning with the incipit "Pray," and concluding with "that he [God] forgive us our sins," preceding each of the priestly prayers of intercession for the various categories: for the Church, the sick, travellers, for the rising of the Nile, for rulers, the dead, the offerers, the patriarch, the bishops and clergy, the Orthodox people, the locale, the monks, the people present, all for whom they pray, the local church and clergy, the local congregation and all congregations.[58] The entire liturgical unit is prefaced by the following rubric:

> During the reading of the kuddās [= anaphora] the priest shall make a sign to the deacon that he pray and inform the congregation of the prayer and the suitable exhortation from the beginning of the kuddās to the end of it in each several prayer according as it is arranged in the sacred horologia likewise.[59]

These are not diptychs, however, but rather the typical Alexandrian and Roman style intercessions, consisting in a repetition of the basic liturgical unit comprising diaconal *Oremus* (or, as in this case, extended *Oremus*, i.e. with the intentions of the oration being introduced explicitated) plus oration.[60]

[56] CUMING.

[57] TH. SCHERMANN, *Ägyptische Abendmahlsliturgien des ersten Jahrtausends in ihrer Überlieferung* (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, Bd. VI., Heft 1./2.. Paderborn 1912).

[58] LEW 165.24-174. Note the undifferentiated form of the intercessions, with the living and dead intermingled.

[59] LEW 165.30-33.

[60] I analyze this liturgical unit in R. TAFT, "The Structural Analysis of Liturgical Units: An Essay in Methodology," BEW 154-6.

II. The Ethiopian Diptychs

For the true Egyptian diptychs we must turn, then, to earlier sources. But before doing that we might cite the diptychs reported by Brightman for the Ethiopic liturgy, presumably derived from Coptic usage, though this is a tradition in which I can pretend no competence:

> For the sake of the blessed and holy archpope abba N. and the blessed pope abba N., while they yet give thee thanks in their prayers and supplication; Stephen the protomartyr, Zacharias the priest and John the Baptist, and for the sake of all the saints and martyrs who have gained their rest in the faith: Matthew and Mark, Luke and John the four evangelists, Mary the parent of God: hear us. For the sake of Peter and Andrew, James and John, Philip and Bartholomew, Thomas and Matthew, Thaddaeus and Nathanael, and James the son of Alphaeus, and Matthias, the twelve apostles; and James the apostle, the brother of our Lord, the bishop of Jerusalem; Paul, Timothy, Silas and Barnabus, Titus, Philemon, Clement, the seventy-two disciples; the fifty companions, the 318 orthodox [fathers of Nicea I]: the prayers of them all come to us, and with them do thou visit us.
>
> And remember thou the Catholic Apostolic Church in peace, which was made by the precious blood of Christ.
>
> Remember thou all archpopes, popes, bishops, presbyters and deacons, and all Christian people.[61]

III. The Lamp of Darkness

Around 1320, a Coptic priest of the Church of al-Mu'allaqa in Old Cairo named Šams ar-Ri'āsah abu'l-Barakāt ibn Kabar († 1325) composed in Arabic a commentary on the usages of the Coptic Church called *The Lamp of Darkness and Explanation of the Liturgy*,[62] of which chapters 16-19 treat of the eucharistic liturgy. In chapter 17, commenting on Coptic GREG, Abu'l Barakāt has this to say of the anaphoral intercessions and diptychs:

> And at the liturgy of Gregory, after the agios, agios, agios [=Sanctus]...the prayers of commemoration are said, which are: [for] peace, the pope, the fathers, the priests, the deacons and the seven orders (τάγματα) of the Church; the salvation of the world, of the city, the countryside and villages and of each

[61] LEW 228.24-229.7

[62] Full details on this work in VILLECOURT I; on the author, see GRAF II, 438-45.

monastery; the fruits [of the earth], the trees and vine, and for the holy offering and the sacrifice.

Then he [the priest] makes a sign to the deacons to mention the names of the patriarchs and the fathers.

1. And they begin first by mentioning Our Lady the Virgin
2. and saints John the Baptist
3. and Stephen, the protodeacon,
4. and the patriarch then reigning on the throne of Mark. And if the see is vacant with no patriarch, the name of the deceased one is mentioned until another is enthroned. Then the name of the dead [patriarch] will be added at the end of the [list of] names of the [dead] fathers,
5. after whom Severus, Patriarch of Antioch, is named.[63]

This late text describing medieval Coptic usage accurately reflects, with due account taken for variants and local usage in an area where liturgical unity was long in coming, what we find in earlier Egyptian Greek diptychal fragments.

1. There was only one set of diptychs, in which both living and dead were listed.
2. It began with Mary, John the Baptist, St. Stephen (nos. 1-3).
3. To them were usually added, as we shall see, St. Mark and other saints,
4. then the reigning pope (no. 4),
5. and, outside the latter's see of Alexandria, the local bishop.
6. Then came the list of the deceased popes of Alexandria (no. 4)
7. to which, finally, was appended the name of the Monophysite hero Severus of Antioch (no. 5), a commemoration we shall return to when discussing the Boston Diptych in section IV.4 below.

IV. The Diptychal Fragments

Among the later extant liturgical texts and fragments from Egypt, eleven Greek texts have been identified as intercessory or diptychal or possibly so.[64] I list them in chronological order:

1. Papyrus Cairo 10395A, second half of the 6th c., provenance unknown.[65]

[63] VILLECOURT II, 254.

[64] VH 768, 866, 910, 923, 929, 931, 1052, 1166; plus two additional fragments, edited by BROCK and MCCORMICK.

[65] BASTIANINI-GALLAZZI.

2. Papyrus Berlin 3602, 7th c., from Fayum = VH 866.
3. The Luxor Diptych, AD 623-662, from Luxor = VH 1052.
4. The Boston Diptych, AD 626-655,[66]
5. Rainer 4.60 = Papyrus Vienna G 26107, 9th c., from Fayum = VH 1166.
6. Coptica Lovaniensia 28, 9-10th c., provenance unknown = VH 768.[67]
7. British Library Add. 17195, AD 956-974, probably from Dayr as-Suryan in Scetis (Wadi an-Natrun).[68]
8. Papyrus London 514[69] = British Library Or. 4718(4), 10th c., provenance unkown = VH 929.
9. Papyrus London 513 = British Library Oriental 4718(3), undated, from Fayum = VH 910.
10. Papyrus London 155 = British Library Oriental 3580A(12), late, from Assuyt = VH 923.
11. Papyrus London 971 = British Library Oriental 4917(6), late, from Panopolis = VH 931.

Let us examine these texts one by one. In dealing with them, as with any Egyptian intercessory text, we must bear in mind that Egyptian liturgical formularies are riddled with intercessory prayers, often using a "Formelgut" liturgical vocabulary of stock phrases common to all liturgical Greek across the traditions, not only in the lengthy presanctus anaphoral intercessions and in the diptychs properly so called,[70] but also in the Enarxis and Liturgy of the Word of the eucharist,[71] to say nothing of the Morning and Evening Offering of Incense.[72]

[66] Ed. McCormick. The last name listed is Andronicus (619-Jan. 626); his successor, not listed, was Benjamin (Jan. 626-Jan. 665).

[67] Ed. Lefort, "Coptica Lovaniensia," 25-6 (no. 28).

[68] Ed. Brock. On Scetis, see R. Taft, "A Pilgrimage to the Origins of Religious Life: The Fathers of the Desert Today," *The American Benedictine Review* 36 (1985) 113-142, and the relevant literature cited there.

[69] The Papyrus London numbers refer to the traditional numbering in Crum, *Catalogue*.

[70] E.g. Cuming 22-37.

[71] E.g. Cuming 5-9, 13-15.

[72] On this service see H. Quecke, *Untersuchungen zum koptischen Stundengebet* (Publications de l'Institut orientaliste de Louvain 3, Louvain 1970) 2-13; O.H.E. Burmester, *The Egyptian or Coptic Church. A Detailed Description of her Liturgical Services and the Rites and Ceremonies observed in the Administration of her Sacraments* (Publications de la Société d'archéologie copte: textes et documents, Cairo 1967) 35-45; English trans. in John Marquis of Bute, *The Coptic Liturgy. The Coptic Morning Service for the Lord's Day* (London 1908); id., *The Coptic Morning Service for the Lord's Day* (London 1882); outline of the service in Taft, *Hours* 253-4.

1. *Papyrus Cairo 10395A*

The liturgical piece in the late sixth-century *Papyrus Cairo 10395A* edited by G. Bastianini and C. Gallazzi is a straightforward Egyptian Greek intercessory fragment, possibly anaphoral, as the editors indicate. It commemorates Mary, the saints, and the dead, as follows:

> For the graces of the holy virgin mother Mary and the holy disciples and apostles and evangelists, and for the dormition and respose of the patriarchs, prophets, martyrs, orthodox bishops, clergy and laity, and of all the deceased just ones whom we mention by name and of all those not [mentioned] by name.[73]

It is impossible to tell with certainty whether this is an anaphoral intercession or a diptychal fragment, though I would lean toward the former. But the remembrance "of all the deceased just ones whom we mention by name" could well refer to the diptychal lists, and could imply that in the diptychs of the departed, at least, it was customary to name not just the hierarchical dignitaries, but also the ordinary faithful departed for whom prayers had been requested and, perhaps, an offering made.

2. *Papyrus Berlin 3602*

The seventh-century fragment in *Papyrus Berlin 3602*, a single pergamen folio from Fayum, gives a mixed list of living and dead beginning with Mary Theotokos, then Bishop John – presumably the reigning local ordinary – and "all deceased orthodox bishops," then, by name, "the Apostle and Evangelist Mark," after which are listed twenty deceased popes of Alexandria recognized by the Copts: seven Orthodox from Peter Martyr (300-311) to Dioscorus deposed by Chalcedon (451),[74] then the eight Monophysites from Timothy Aelurus (457-477) to Theodosius (535-566), followed by Peter (575-578), Damian (578-607) and Anastasius (607-619),[75] as follows:

1.] κου // κ[αι της παναγιας] Μαριας και [παντων των] αγιων ·

2. Ιωαννης επισκο[πος το ευ]χαριστηριον //

[73] BASTIANINI-GALLAZZI 101.

[74] FEDALTO II, 582. I give the dates from this most recent source, though Fedalto's dating may differs from Chaîne's, whom he does not cite: M. CHAÎNE, *La chronologie des temps chrétiens de l'Égypte et de l'Éthiopie* (Paris 1925) 251-4.

[75] FEDALTO II, 586-7.

3. και υ[περ της] κοιμησεως των θεο[φιλεστατων] πατερων ημων ορθοδοξων αρχιεπισκ[ο]πων //
4. Μαρκου αποστολ[ο]υ κ[αι] ευαγγελιστου //

---

5. Πετρου...Αναστασιου.[76]

I would take this to be: (1) the ekphonesis for Mary that introduces the diptychs of GREG;[77] (2-4) the diaconal diptychs, beginning with the presiding local hierarch John (2), then the list of the dead patriarchs of Alexandria (3-5), beginning, as usual, with St. Mark (4) and then listing the others. This interpretation will, I think, receive further confirmation in the texts discussed below in sections 7, 9.

According to Gerhards, however, this may not have been the original shape of the diptychs of GREG. The text in question reads as follows:

1. Ὁ Διάκονος λέγει τὰ Δίπτυχα.
2. Ὁ Ἱερεὺς λέγει ἐν ἑαυτῷ.
3. Μνήσθητι κύριε τῶν προκεκοιμημένων ἐν τῇ ὀρθοδόξῳ πίστει πατέρων ἡμῶν καὶ ἀδελφῶν, καὶ ἀνάπαυσον τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν μετὰ ὁσίων, μετὰ δικαίων.
4. Ἔκθρεψον, σύναψον εἰς τόπον χλόης, ἐπὶ ὕδατος ἀναπαύσεως, ἐν παραδείσῳ τρυφῆς, καὶ μετὰ τούτων, ὧν εἴπομεν τὰ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν.
5. Τότε μνημονεύει ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν, καὶ μετὰ δίπτυχα ὁ Ἱερεὺς λέγει.
6. Μνήσθητι κύριε ὧν ἐμνήσθημεν καὶ ὧν οὐκ ἐμνήσθημεν, πιστῶν καὶ ὀρθοδόξων, μεθ' ὧν καὶ ἡμῖν σὺν αὐτοῖς ὡς ἀγαθὸς καὶ φιλάνθρωπος θεός.[78]

Gerhards hypothesizes, not implausibly, that segment (3), now part of the anaphoral intercessions recited by the presider in silence, may once have been the original ekphonesis that introduced the diptychs of the dead. In similar fashion the presider would have concluded the diptychs aloud with a second ekphonesis, segment (6) in the text above, now equally a silent part of the presider's anaphoral intercessions. The intervening segment of text (4) would be a later addition, after the rest had come to be recited in silence.[79]

[76] Ed. by O. STEGMÜLLER, "Christliche Texte aus der Berliner Papyrussammlung," *Aegyptus* 17 (1937) 454.
[77] GERHARDS 46.362-76.
[78] GERHARDS 46.377-48.391.
[79] GERHARDS 101.

3. *The Luxor Diptych*

In 1908 the renowned Britsh Coptologist W.E. Crum published a seventh-century Greek diptych fragment in palimpsest from the collection of W. Moir Bryce of Edinburgh, which had been purchased in Luxor in 1903.[80] The diptychs of the living are straightforward enough:[81]

1. ⟨Μνήσθητι Κύριε⟩ Ἀββᾶ ἁγαθ[ώνος] [τοῦ] μακαριωτάτου ἡμῶν πατρ[ιάρχου] τὸ εὐχαριστήριον[82] ⟨προσφερόντου⟩·
2. καὶ απα Πε[σ]υνθίου τοῦ ὁσιωτάτου ἡμῶν ἐπισκόπου τὸ εὐχαριστήριον ⟨προσφερόντου⟩·
3. καὶ ὑ[π]ὲρ τῆς σωτηρίας καὶ εὐτασθείας παντὸς τοῦ παρεστῶτος εὐαγεστάτου κλήρου καὶ παντὸς τοῦ φιλοχρίστου λαοῦ ⟨προσεύξασθε⟩·
4. καὶ ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας καὶ ὑγιείας τῶν προσενεγκάντων τοῦδε καὶ τῆσδε
5. καὶ προσενεγκόντων τὰ δῶρα αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ
6. καὶ πάντων τῶν προσφερόντων ⟨προσεύξασθε⟩.

The use of εὐχαριστήριον (1-2), "thank-offering,"[83] for the eucharist, a liturgical "Markism,"[84] probably betrays these lists (and others below) as originally intended for use in MK, though the later, Byzantinized text of MK has a rubric only for the diptychs of the dead.[85] Note also the rubric (4) for the names not just of men but also of women (τοῦδε καὶ τῆσδε) – hence of the laity, not just clergy – to be inserted in the diptychal naming, after the commemoration of the bishop (2) and all the clergy and laity present (3). According to Edmund Bishop this shows for the first time

> the parochial use of diptychs for mere commonplace persons which is so well attested in the West. With this diptych in hand we have now documentary evidence for such use, at all events in Egypt.[86]

[80] CRUM, "Diptych," 255-65.

[81] Ed. *ibid.* 263-5; LECLERCQ 1165-6; additions in ⟨⟩ brackets are mine. Text commented in BISHOP, "Comments" III; CABROL 1091-3; LECLERCQ 1163.

[82] CRUM, "Diptych," 258, would have this phrase preceded by πρόσδεξαι ὁ θεός: cf. CUMING 31.1-2, 32.8-9. I suggest, rather, Μνήσθητι, Κύριε.

[83] G.W.H. LAMPE, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford 1961) 579; cf. BISHOP, "Comments" III, 67-8. In Egyptian usage it usually refers to an offering for the dead, though contrary to E. PETERSON, "Die alexandrinische Liturgie bei Kosmas Indikopleustes," EL 46 (1932) 66-74, Engberding has shown that the term itself does not necessarily have only that meaning: H. ENGBERDING, "Eucharisterion in ägyptischer liturgischen Texten," in P. WIRTH (ed.), *Polychordia. Festschrift F. Dölger*, II (Byzantinische Forschungen 2, Amsterdam 1967) 148-161.

[84] BISHOP, "Comments" III, 67-8; cf. MK, CUMING 31.1-2, 32.8-9.

[85] CUMING 30.24.

[86] BISHOP, "Comments" III. 72.

The diptychs of the dead commemorate Mary Theotokos, John the Baptist, John the Apostle, Mark the Evangelist, Peter and the other apostles, in customary form:

> τῆς παναγίας ἐνδόξου θεοτόκο[υ καὶ] ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας,
> απα Ἰωάν[νου] ⟨τοῦ⟩ βαπτιστοῦ,
> καὶ απα Ἰωάννου παρ[θένου]
> Μάρκου εὐαγγελιστοῦ,
> Πέτρου [ἀποστό]λου,
> καὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ[οστόλων].

There follows immediately, with no introductory or concluding formula, the Monophysite list of the deceased popes of Alexandria, from Mark's successor Anianus (62-85) to Andronicus (619-626), with his successor Benjamin (626-665) added in a later hand.[87] This text seems to be a conflation of the priest's opening ekphonesis with the deacon's diptychal lists.[88]

Panel B[89] continues with the catalogue of deceased local bishops in two series, each introduced by ἔτι δὲ καὶ, and concluded by the martyr of the day:

> ἔτι δὲ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου ἀθλοφόρου καὶ νικηφόρου μάρτυρος ἀββᾶ τίνος: οὗ τὴν μνήμην ἐπιτελοῦμεν κατὰ τὴν σήμερον ἡμέραν.

The final phrase is a common Alexandrianism in the intercessions/diptychs of the dead, as in the fragment of MK from the fourth-fifth century *Papyrus Strasbourg 254* (μνήσθητι τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας τὴν ὑπόμνησιν ποιούμεθα) and MK/GREG (καὶ ὧν ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ τὴν ὑπόμνησιν ποιούμεθα)[90]

After discussing the various possibilities for identifying its diocese of origin from this list, Crum concludes: "It is unfortunate that internal evi-

[87] CRUM, "Diptych," 258-9; cf. FEDALTO II, 587, for Benjamin's dates. BRAKMANN, "Severos," 56, has drawn attention to the remark of Abu'l-Barakāt ibn Kabar (ca. 1320) that the name of the dead pope continues to be named in the diptychs until his successor is enthroned (VILLECOURT II, 254 = no. 4 of text cited above in section D.III).

[88] Cf. GERHARDS 46.362ff.

[89] CRUM, "Diptych," 264-5 (text), 259-62.

[90] PE 118; CUMING 114, 29.9; GERHARDS 46.372-373.

dence does not...allow us to fix precisely the *provenance* of Mr. Bryce's diptych."[91]

4. *The Boston Diptych*

The tablet preserved in the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, Massachusetts, presents simply a list of deceased popes of Alexandria,[92] ending, like the Luxor Diptych, also with Andronicus (619-626) – after whom, however, is appended the name Severus,[93] which puzzled McCormick but whom Brakmann identified as Severus, Monophysite patriarch of Antioch (512-518),[94] an identification confirmed by the later Egyptian diptych edited by Brock (no. 7 below),[95] as well as by Abu'l-Barakāt's *The Lamp of Darkness*, chapter 17, cited in section D.III above, and much earlier by the ca. sixth-century *Papyrus Berlin 17612*.[96] If the dating of this text is reliable, it is the earliest witness to this phenomenon of universalization, clearly the most interesting element liturgically in these Egyptian diptychs of the dead. It shows the gradual shift from a *local* to a *confessional, sanctoral* character of the text.

But with no introductory or concluding formulas to indicate just how this Boston diptychal tablet was meant to be employed liturgically, the text is not of much use for our purposes.

5. *The Vienna Papyrus*

The very fragmentary Vienna *Papyrus Rainer 4.60* (= *Papyrus Vindob. G 26107*), is described by van Haelst (VH 1166) as:

> Parchemin. Fragment des marges d'intérieures d'un feuillet double: 4x3,5 cm, débuts 5 lignes. écriture cursive.

[91] CRUM, "Diptych," 262; also ID., "The Bishop's named in Mr. Bryce's Diptych," PSBA 31 (1909) 288, and the remarks of P. MAAS, BZ 18 (1909) 624-5.

[92] Text in MCCORMICK 50-1. I am grateful to Professor McCormick for providing me with me an offprint of his valuable study.

[93] *Ibid.* 51, cf. 53.

[94] BRAKMANN, "Severus."

[95] BROCK 25-6.

[96] H. BRAKMANN, "Literaturbericht," ALW 30 (1988) 356. I have not seen this text or any full description or edition of it.

IXe siècle. Fayoum.

"Notiz über die Hierarchie der Kirche". Selon moi, probablement un fragment d'un diptyque.

But the fragment, edited by Sanz,[97] just lists, in the dative plural, "bishops, presbyters, all deacons, brothers":

αλ[... τοις επι]
σκοπ[οις ... και τοις πρεσ]
βυτεροι[σ ... και τοις δι] ακονοις απ[ασιν ... και]
τοις αδελφ[οις ...

Here too, this fragmentary text, not even certainly a diptych, is of little help in reconstructing the liturgical uses of Egypt. But if the incipit can be construed as ἀλ⟨ηθείας⟩, then an echo of intercessions similar to those for the patriarch and clergy in MK could be proposed (the dative remains a problem, but Egyptian Greek texts are notorious for their bizarre syntax):

Μνήσθητι, Κύριε...τοῦ Δ. πάπας...ὀρθτομοῦντα τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας. Μνήσθητι, Κύριε, καὶ τῶν ἁπαντάχου ὀρθοδόξων ἐπισκόπων, πρεσβυτέρων, διακόνων, ὑποδιακόνων...etc.[98]

However, identifying what the text might in fact be, if not a diptych, is not my concern here.

6. *Coptica Lovaniensia 28*

Louvain Fragment no. 28 published by Lefort[99] is far too idiosyncratic to be considered a normal Alexandrian liturgical list. It recalls the deceased Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus and Liberius (of Rome?), Ignatius (of Antioch?), Celestine (of Rome?), Dionysius (the Pseudo Aeropagite?), Patriarch Severus (doubtless of Antioch), Gregory of Armenia (the Illuminator), Gregory the Theologian, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Gregory εννησοσ (= ὁ Νύσσης, of Nyssa?), Kyrios, Kyriakos (of Antioch, 793-817?), Cyril of Jerusalem, Severus of Gabbala, and the Forty Holy Martys of Sebaste.

[97] P. SANZ, *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien (Papyrus Erherzog Rainer)*, Neue Serie, Bd. 3. *Griechische literarische Papryi christlichen Inhalts (Biblica, Väterschriften, und Verwandtes)* (Vienna 1946) 133.

[98] CUMING 32.8-33.16.

[99] LEFORT, "Coptica Lovaniensia," 25-6.

I do not know what this represents, except that it certainly is not a normal liturgical diptych of the dead in any tradition, but more like a list of sanctoral commemorations.

7. *The Diptychs in Codex British Library Add. 17195*

Of great liturgical interest, however, are the Egyptian Greek texts discovered by Professor Sebastian Brock of Oxford in the Syriac ms *British Library Add. 17195*, and recently edited by him.[100] Probably written at the Syrian Monophysite Monastery of Dayr as-Suryan in Scetis, the Wadi an-Natrun, ca. AD 956-974, the text contains two distinct liturgical pieces. The first, which Brock identifies somewhat too vaguely as "a part of the intercession for the departed following the epiclesis in the Eastern anaphoras (apart from that of St Mark/Cyril),"[101] seems actually a variant reading of the anaphoral intercessions for the departed in GREG.[102]

I would parse the text as follows:

1. [*Priest:*] κ(αὶ) πά⟨ν⟩των τῶν ἐν ὀρθ⟨οδοξίᾳ⟩ διδαξά⟨ν⟩των κ(αὶ) ὀρθοτομησάντων τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας ὀρθοδόξων πατέρων κ(αὶ) τούτων κα⟨ὶ⟩ πάντων:
2. [*Deacon:*] προσεύξα⟨σ⟩θε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν πίστει Χριστοῦ κοιμηθέντων.
3. [*Deacon:*] καὶ τῶ⟨ν⟩ θλιβομένω[ν] προσεύξασθε.

The last two pieces (2-3) are obviously diaconal interjections. The piece Brock rightly identifies as diptychs reads:

> [*Deacon:*] καὶ ὑπὲρ κοιμήσεως καὶ ἀναπαύσεως τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῶν τῶν ὀρθοδ⟨ὸ⟩ξων κα⟨ὶ⟩ ὀρθοτομοῦντα τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας Μάρκου τοῦ θείοι (*sic*) ἡμῶν ἀποστόλου εὐαγγελιστοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου καὶ μάρτυρος

There follows immediately the Coptic Church's list of sixty popes of Alexandria from Mark's successor Anianus (62-85) to Menas II (956-974)[103] concluded by τῶν ἀρχιεπισκόπων, to which is appended the commemoration of Severus of Antioch, as earlier, in the Boston diptych (no. 4 above), and later, in Abu'l-Barakat[104]: καὶ τοῦ θεοφόρου Σευήρου τοῦ μεγάλου πατριάρχου Ἀντιοχία⟨ς⟩.

These are clearly diptychs with their introductory ekphonesis. This

[100] BROCK 24-6.
[101] BROCK 25.
[102] GERHARDS 38.253-4 and apparatus 251.
[103] FEDALTO II, 581, 588.
[104] No. 5 in the text cited above in section D.III.

ekphonesis, one should note, includes the Formelgut phrase of 2 Tim 2:15, "rightly handling the word of [your] truth," first seen in the anaphoral intercessions of *ApConst* VIII, 12:40,[105] and employed in intercessions/diptychs across the traditions, including GREG[106] and MK/Cyril,[107] as well as EgBAS.[108]

8. *Papyrus London 514*

The tenth-century *Papyrus London 514*, listed as of unknown provenance but obviously from Fayum, as will become clear from the liturgical commemorations, comprises papyrus fragment codex *British Library Or. 4718(4)*. This text has been identified as possibly a diptychal fragment (VH 910), which indeed it is.[109] The recto is a list of incipits of diptychal or intercessory liturgical formulas.

Difficult to interpret, the highly corrupt Greek text lists the commemorations in the following, somewhat bizarre order:

1. ? The Holy Spirit (text defective).
2. The One Holy Catholic Church making the thank-offering (εὐχαριστήριον).
3. Mary Theotokos.
4. The apostle(s).
5. Pope Chael of Alexandria.
6. Abba Victor.
7. The presbyter(s).
8. The deacon(s).
9. The subdeacon(s).
10. The lector(s).
11. The psalmist(s).
12. The laity.

The mention of the Holy Spirit could mean that these were diptychs for use with MK, to be inserted after the greeting, "The grace of the all-Holy Spirit [be] with all of you, brothers.. Amen."[110] The presence of the term εὐχαριστήριον confirms this.

I would take what follows, on the same recto side, as five φήμη inci-

[105] See chapter V, section B.I.1.
[106] GERHARDS 38.254.
[107] CUMING 32-3; LEW 121.18, 160.36ff; PE 108.
[108] DORESSE-LANNE 22-3; PE 354.
[109] CRUM, *Catalogue* 247-48 gives the transcription.
[110] Cf. CUMING 30.22-4.

pits, all beginning with the name of the same bishop Victor – Κύρι⟨ο⟩ς ἀββᾶ Βίκτ⟨ωρ⟩ – and listing his titles: hierarch of Christ, most eminent bishop of the city of Arsinoe (al-Fayûm), bridegroom of the altar, thirteenth apostle, help of widows and orphans, each acclamation ending with the *Ad multos annos* (πολλοῖς χρόνοις ἐν εἰρηνικοῖς χρόνοις), and, at the very end, πολλὰ καὶ καλὰ καὶ πολλὰ τὰ ἔτι πολλοῖς χρόνοις ἐν εἰρηνικοῖς χρόνοις (I correct the bizarre orthography without notice).

The verso side of the fragment gives what is even more clearly a series of acclamations, ending with πολλὰ ⟨τὰ ἔτη⟩, all for the same hierarchs, pope Chael and bishop Victor, extolling the spiritual kinship between them and the other Alexandrian saints. In the order in which they appear, Abba Chael, hierarch of Alexandria, is called the child of Mark, whereas Victor is the son of Chael and brother of Athanasius, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Gregory the Theologian, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Ignatius. Chael is the first hierarch, Victor is an orthodox bishop and the light of the people. Chael, finally, is the splendor of the oikoumene. In sum, I would consider only the first part of this text on the recto side as a diptych fragment.

Though there are problems in dating the text, the naming of the bishop of Fayum clearly betrays that see as its place of origin. In the eighth-ninth centuries there were three popes of Alexandria named Chael (Michael), in the years 743-767, 849-851, and 880-907.[111] and, as Crum observes, the "ad multos annos" acclamations for him show that he was alive when the text was composed.[112] For paleographical reasons Crum favors a later date, and hence opts for the last Chael.[113] But the only Victor of Arsinoe (al-Fayûm) Fedalto lists was bishop in 631-642,[114] and thus contemporaneous to none of the Chaels. The list for the see of Arsinoe (Fayum) is very lacunal, however, so nothing can be argued from that. Besides, the question is irrelevant for our purposes.

9. *Papyrus London 513*

The undated *Papyrus London 513*, a very small fragment comprising codex *British Library Or. 4718(3)*, gives the incipit of the diptychs of

[111] Fedalto II, 587-8.
[112] Crum, *Catalogue* 248.
[113] Crum, *Catalogue* 247.
[114] Fedalto II, 631.

GREG.[115] This is betrayed by the phrase "the whole choir of saints – καὶ παντὸς τοῦ χοροῦ τῶν ἁγίων σου," characteristic of GREG.[116] The text gives the end of the celebrant's ekphonesis and the incipit of the diaconal diptychs of the dead.[117] After a blank space preceding it, the text begins:

> Ꝑ καὶ παντὸς τοῦ χοροῦ τῶν ἁγί[ων σου:] (ὧν ταῖς εὐχαῖς καὶ πρεσβείαις καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐλέησον καὶ σῶσον διὰ τὸ ὄνομά σου τὸ ἅγιον τὸ ἐπικλήθεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς
>
> ὁ διάκονος· τοῦ) ἐπισκόπου καὶ ἀββᾶ κυριακῶ[ς] Μηνᾶ τὸ εὐχαριστήριον:
>
> καὶ ἀναπαύσον [...][118]

The Menas referred to could be the pope Menas either of 767-775 or of 956-974.

10. *Papyrus London 155*

The very fragmentary remainder of a diptychal text in *Papyrus London 155* comprises fragments 11-12 of codex *British Library Or. 3580A(12)*, a late text from Assuyt.[119] In their present shape, the fragments are found in the following order:

1. Fragment 11, fol. a, lists the names of the patriarchs of Alexandria from the ninth, Celadion (153/4-167/8) to the nineteenth, Alexander (?-362).[120]
2. Fragment 11, folio b, has the names of other hierarchs, probably the deceased local bishops.
3. Fragment 12, fol. a, apparently initiates the list of local bishops in 11.b.
4. Fragment 12, fol. b, which I would judge to be the actual beginning of the text, commemorates Mary Theotokos, John the Baptist, and other saints.

Since the text contains only names, with no introductory or concluding liturgical formulas or accompanying rubrics, it gives us no help in de-

[115] Text in CRUM, *Catalogue* 247.
[116] GERHARDS 46.373.
[117] GERHARDS 46.
[118] CRUM *Catalogue* 247.
[119] Text in CRUM, *Catalogue* 43-4.
[120] FEDALTO II, 581-2.

termining its liturgical use. The logical arrangement of the text would seem to be 4, 3, 2, 1 (= fragments 12.b, 12.a, 11.b, 11.a), though how or if that could be possible I cannot judge, not having seen the actual ms.

11. *Papyrus London 971*

The final text, *Papyrus London 971* on the verso of codex *British Library Or. 4917(12)*, is a late diptychal fragment from Panopolis. The text reads as follows (fol. b):[121]

1. [...] βαπτίστου Ἰωάννου
2. ἀββᾶ Βενιαμὶν ἀρχιεπισκόπου καὶ ἀββᾶ Εὐνόμου ἐπισκόπου ὀρθοδόξου τὸ εὐχαριστήριον:
3. καὶ ὑπὲρ κοιμήσεως[122] (τὰ ὀνόματα) τῶν ἁγίων ἀθλοφόρων μαρτύρων απα Βίκτορος

This is an Egyptian diptychal text of the sort already encountered, comprising, in its original state:

1. An opening phrase including the remembrance of Mary Theotokos, the Baptist, and other principal saints, chanted by the presiding celebrant as an integral part of the anaphora.
2. The names of reigning and/or presiding hierarchs, i.e. those making the offering – that is what τὸ εὐχαριστήριον means.
3. The names of the dead popes of Alexandria from Mark on, introduced by a set formula.

V. Conclusion D: The Diptychs in Egypt

Indeed, this last text, *Papyrus London 971*, can serve as a paradigm, for its three constitutive elements just listed are the common characteristics of the diptychs in Egypt. Other lists with only names, like the Boston Diptych (no. 4), were, in actual use, obviously intended to be inserted within a similar liturgical framework of opening and concluding phrases. In one instance, the more elaborate Luxor Diptych (no. 3), which omits the celebrant's ekphonesis [1] but appends to [2] gener-

[121] Crum, *Catalogue* 400.

[122] Crum, 400 no. 1, mistakenly identifies this as a rubric.

al formulas for the clergy and laity and offerers, and those for whom they have offered. To the list of the saints is appended the catalogue of dead local bishops – not of Alexandria – and a concluding formula for the saint of the day. Furthermore, the same Luxor Diptych, together with fragment I (*Papyrus Cairo 10395A*), provide evidence that at least in some areas of Egypt it may also have been customary to name in the diptychs some of the ordinary faithful, living or dead, for whom prayers had been requested.

There is considerable local variety in the introductory and concluding liturgical formulas in which the names are framed, differences attributable to the insertion of the diptychs into one of several Egyptian anaphoral structures: MK, GREG, EgBAS, Sarapion, and undoubtedly others – no area has turned up so many early anaphora fragments as Egypt[123] – as well as to the great variety of local liturgies within a com-

[123] In addition to the early texts in PE 101-41, with the respective bibliography given there, and above in chapter II, section C.I, see, *inter alia*, VH 737, 742, 760, 772, 819, 833, 854, 863, 864, 889, 922, 934, 1042; and specifically: EgBAS, DORESSE-LANNE and BRAKMANN, "Basileios-Liturgie;" E. LANNE (ed.), *Le grande euchologe du Monastère Blanc*, PO 28.2 (Paris 1958); ID., Les textes de la liturgie eucharistique en dialecte sahidique," Mus 68 (1955) 5-16; H. LIETZMANN, "Sahidische Bruchstücke der Gregorios- und Kyrillosliturgie," OC new series 9 (1920) 1-19; the liturgical fragments in LEFORT, "Coptica Lovaniensia," 22-32, some of which are doubtless anaphoral; K. TREU, "Neue Berliner liturgische Papyri," *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 21 (1971) 72-4, fragment no. 8 = a 5-6th c. parchment fragment *P. 17 032* now in the Ägyptischer Abteilung of the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin (DDR at the time of writing); on the same text see K. GAMBER, "Teilstück einer Anaphora auf einem Pergamenblatt des 5./6. Jahrhunderts aus Ägypten," OKS 36 (1987) 186-92; H. SATZINGER, "Koptische Papyrus-Fragmente des Wiener Kunsthistorischen Museums," *Chronique d'Égypte* 46 (1971) 419-431: fragment *Nr. 1, Inv. 8599b* may be an anaphoral fragment (cf. BRAKMANN, "Literaturbericht," ALW 19 [1978] 199); K. ZENTGRAF, "Eucharistische Textfragmente einer koptisch-saïdischen Hs.," OC 41 (1957) 67-75, 42 (1958) 44-54, 43 (1959) 76-102; the numerous texts edited by H. QUECKE, "Das anaphorische Dankgebet auf dem koptischen Ostrakon Nr. 1133 der Leningrader Eremitage neu herausgegeben," OCP 40 (1974) 42-56; "Das anaphorische Dankgebet auf den koptischen Ostraka B. M. Nr. 32 799 und 33 050 neu herausgegeben," OCP 37 (1971) 391-405; "Ein neues koptisches Anaphora-Fragment (Bonn. Univ.-Bibl. So 267)," OCP 39 (1973) 216-223; "Ein koptischer Papyrus mit den Einsetzungsworten der Eucharistie (PPalau Rib. Inv. 138)," *Studia Papyrologica* 8 (1969) 43-53, 125; "Ein saïdisches Eucharistiefragment (Berlin, Ms. or. fol. 1609 a)," Mus 79 (1966) 113-131, 315; "Ein saïdischer Zeuge der Markusliturgie (Brit. Mus. Nr. 54 036)," OCP 37 (1971) 40-54; the "Barcelona Anaphora" being edited and com-

mon liturgical framework in each area in the Early Church and, indeed, throughout Late Antiquity, a situation best seen, in fact, in the rich supply of Egyptian sources.

But this should not blind us to the common, basic structural features of these Egyptian diptychs:

1. The lists of the living and dead were read together, not separately at two distinct moments of the liturgy as in Constantinople.
2. Since in all but one extant text, the Luxor Diptych, only saints and hierarchs are actually named, only the diptychs of the dead contained an actual list of names.
3. The commemoration by name of the reigning bishop was inserted after the general commemoration of Mary and the saints.
4. Since the bishop is typically described as τὸ εὐχαριστήριον, i.e. the one presiding at the thanksgiving, it is probable that the diptychs were for use only at a pontifical liturgy.
5. St. Mark heads the episcopal lists as first pope of Alexandria, not because he is a saint.
6. The *nomina* that follow, all names of dead persons, are usually, but not always, the Alexandrian list, doubtless one more sign of Alexandria's tight control over the highly-centralized Church of

mented in dribs and drabs by R. ROCA-PUIG, "Sui papiri di Barcellona. Anafora greca secondo la liturgia di san Marco," *Aegyptus* 46 (1966) 91-92; ID., "Frases 'extra textum' en P. Barc. inv. 154b-157," in D.H. SAMUEL (ed.), *Proceedings of the 12th International Congress of Papyrology* (American Studies in Papyrology 7, Toronto 1970) 437-442; ID., "Citas y reminiscencias bíblicas en las anáforas griegas más primitivas," *Βυζαντινά* 4 (1972) 195-203; ID., *La "Creació" a l'Anàfora de Barcelona. Papir de Barcelona, Inv. n.o 154 b* (Barcelona 1979); ID., *La "Redempció" a l'Anàfora de Barcelona. Papir de Barcelona, Inv. n.o 154 b* (Barcelona 1982); ID., *La "Litúrgia angèlica" a l'Anàfora de Barcelona. Papir de Barcelona, Inv. n.o 154 b* (Barcelona 1983); ID., *"Transició" i "Ofrena" a l'Anàfora de Barcelona. Papir de Barcelona, Inv. n.o 154b-155a* (Barcelona 1984); ID., *L'epiclesi primera a l'Anàfora de Barcelona. Papir de Barcelona, Inv. n.o 155a, lín. 2-7* (Barcelona 1987). On this same text see S. JANERAS, "L'original grec del fragment copte de Lovaina núm. 27 en l'Anàfora de Barcelona," *Miscel·lània litúrgica catalana* III (Barcelona 1984) 13-25 (J. shows that it is not a text of MK); J. DEVOS, "Un témoin copte de la plus ancienne anaphore en grec," AB 104 (1986) 126; and the remarks of H. BRAKMANN in ALW 19 (1978) 205-6, 30 (1988) 355-6. Further fragments cited in ID., ALW 19 (1978) 206-8 30 (1988) 353-7; and in the bibliographical references in GERHARDS, CUMING; etc.

Egypt, a situation favored by the intense geographical concentration of the entire Egyptian population in the Nile Delta and, south of it, along the narrow alluvial ribbon of arable land bordering the Nile, and in a few scattered oases.

7. Some texts append Severus of Antioch to this Alexandrian list, betraying an early shift to "confessional diptychs," a phenomenon we saw in Mopsuestia with the insertion of Cyril of Alexandria's name into the lists of the deceased bishops of that local Church, provoking thereby a perplexity which demonstrates that such "confessional diptychs" were a novelty at least in Cilicia in the sixth century.[124]

[124] See chapter II, section C.V. 3.

CHAPTER IV

THE BYZANTINE DIPTYCHS OF THE DEAD: HISTORY AND LITURGY

A. THE HISTORICAL SOURCES

1. John Chrysostom

1. *Homily 21 on the Acts of the Apostles*

John of Antioch, known to us as St. John Chrysostom, guided the destinies of the Church of Constantinople as its bishop from February 398 until his exile on June 9, 404. As with so much in the history of Late Antique liturgy in Constantinople, Chrysostom's preaching is our earliest source for the diptychs of the Great Church. His *In Acta apost. hom. 21*, 4, delivered at Constantinople in 401, reports:

> **1.** It is not in vain that the deacon cries out: "*For those who have fallen asleep in Christ, and for those who have remembrances made for them* (Ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ κεκοιμημένων καὶ τῶν τὰς μνείας ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐπιτελουμένων)." It is not the deacon who utters this sound, but the Holy Spirit – I mean the charism. **2.** What do you say? The sacrifice is at hand, and everything is set out in due order. **3.** Angels are present, archangels; **4.** the Son of God is present; all stand with such awe. And while all are silent, when the emperor is seated – that is the time for one to get whatever one wishes. But once he has risen, whatever one says is in vain. **5.** So too, as long as the mysteries are present it is the greatest honor to be deemed worthy of mention. **6.** For look, then the awesome mystery is announced, that God gave himself up for the world... **7.** The former [the angels] stand by crying aloud. And do you think what is done is done in vain? **8.** Then isn't all the rest in vain too, including the offerings for the Church and the priests and the whole assembly? **9.** ...How about what is offered for the martyrs, or the invocation [of them] made at that hour? Even though they are martyrs, still [we pray] "for the martyrs," **10.** for it is a great honor [for them] to be named while the Master is present, **11.** when that death is accomplished, the

> dread sacrifice, the unutterable mysteries. **12.** For just as, while the Lord is present upon the altar, the sacrifice is accomplished, **13.** before communion, which is mentioned immediately thereafter, it is said: "as often as you eat this bread you proclaim the death of the Lord" [1 Cor 11:20]. So let us not approach [communion] to no avail.[1]

This homily is the earliest and most extensive source on the nature and place of the diptychs in the liturgy of the Great Church. The context of the passage is unmistakably that of the anaphoral intercessions, after the consecration (**11-12**), just before communion (**13**). The economy is narrated (**6**), the Sanctus is chanted (**7**), the sacrifice accomplished (**11-12**), the consecrated gifts are still present on the altar (**2, 4-5, 10, 12**), and at this time the dead (**1, 5**), the Church, the priests, the whole assembly are prayed for (**8**), and the martyrs are commemorated (**9**).[2] During these commemorations/intercessions, however, there is also a diaconal proclamation (**1**), and this can refer only to the diptychs – in this case, of the dead. As already noted, the formula is almost verbatim the same one Chrysostom indicates for Antioch in the parallel passage of his sermon *In 1 Cor hom. 41*, 4-5, cited above in chapter II at the beginning of section C.IV.3. Furthermore, it is almost the same as the diaconal ekphonesis commemorating the dead in the Constantinopolitan diptychs as reported in 655 by Maximus Confessor, *Relatio motionis*, Acta I, 5, a key text cited in full and analyzed below in section A.II.3, where the deacon says: "And for all the laity who have fallen asleep in faith, Constantine, Constantius, and the rest" (Καὶ τῶν ἐν πίστει κεκοιμημένων λαϊκῶν, Κωνσταντίνου, Κώνσταντος, καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς)."[3]

[1] PG 60:170. On this source and its interpretation, cf. VAN DE PAVERD, *Meßliturgie* 501-12; ID., "Intercessions," 333; E. BISHOP, "Comments" IV-VII, 388-90; and the note of R.H. CONNOLLY, JTS 12 (1911) 400-1; against F.E. BRIGHTMAN, "Chronicle," *ibid.* 321-3 and LEW 533.

[2] Against this interpretation, however, K. GAMBER (chapter II at note 84) believes this text, as well as another, Antiochene document cited by VAN DE PAVERD, *Meßliturgie* (doc. no. 106), in this regard, *In 1 Cor hom. 41*, 4-5 (quoted and analyzed in chapter II, section C.IV.3), have nothing to do with the diptychs at Antioch. As we saw above (chapter II, *loc. cit.*), van de Paverd later embraced Gamber's view. I continue to prefer van de Paverd's earlier opinion, in *Meßliturgie* 348-60, 501-12.

[3] PG 90:117D.

2. *Chrysostom and the Diptychs in Exile and Death*

If Chrysostom's homily is the first extant witness to the Byzantine diptychs of the dead, that is certainly not the last time we hear of them in connection with that worthy. They burst suddenly into the limelight of inter-ecclesial politics in the aftermath of Chrysostom's final banishment from his see of Constantinople on June 9, 404, and his death in exile at Camona in Pontus, September 14, 407.

The circumstances of Chrysostom's troubles are well known. He was a pawn in the eternal feud between the sees of Alexandria and Antioch, a power-struggle that was soon to have catastrophic and lasting results during the Monophysite crisis. In the time of Chrysostom, Alexandrian influence in the capital was on the wane, and Theophilus of Alexandria held Chrysostom responsible for the accusations which the monks of Nitria in the desert south of Alexandria had brought against him in 402. Theophilus got his revenge the next year when the Synod of the Oak near Chalcedon resulted in Emperor Arcadius (395-408) decreeing Chrysostom's deposition and exile, an edict which, after a reprieve, was finally executed June 9, 404. This uncanonical procedure was not accepted by Pope Innocent I (401-417) and Chrysostom loyalists, who refused communion with the new patriarch Arsacius (404-405) and his successor Atticus (406-425). Meanwhile, in Alexandria the reigning pope was the famous Cyril († 444), who had succeeded his uncle Theophilus, Chrysostom's enemy, in 412.

It is at this point that the story becomes germane to the diptychs at Constantinople. We hear of them ca. 418 in a letter of Atticus to Cyril. Atticus had caved in to popular demand and restored Chrysostom's name to the diptychs of the dead. Cyril could hardly view this as anything but a provocation, hence the correspondence between him and Atticus on the matter. Nicephorus Callistus (Xanthopoulos) recounts the story in detail in his *Church History* XIV, 25-28,[4] written ca. 1320,[5] not only relating the efforts to rehabilitate Chrysostom, but preserving for us what purports to be the very correspondence between Atticus and Cyril on the delicate subject.[6]

Though Atticus had succeeded in ending the schism of Chrysos-

[4] PG 146:1136-52.

[5] Beck 705-6.

[6] Nicephorus Callistus, HE XIV, 26-27, PG 146:1138-50; also Cyril, *Ep. 85*, PG 77:348-52; cf. *Ep. 86*, PG 77:352 = Reg 40-41.

tom's followers after the saint's death, they were insistent that John's name be recorded in the diptychs of the departed. Obviously, such inclusion was viewed as an important symbol of rehabilitation and legitimacy, and posed a dilemma for Atticus who, after all, was an interloper. To commemorate Chrysostom in the diptychs was to challenge the canonicity of his own Constantinopolitan episcopal succession, which had been effected before the death of the legitimate incumbent, the very same Chrysostom.

The spark that turned smouldering discontent into conflagration was provided by Chrysostom's hometown of Antioch, where popular pressure had already forced the restoration of his name to the diptychs.[7] When the populace at Constantinople got word of this, they were soon in an uproar, demanding Chrysostom's commemoration there too, Atticus tells us.[8] To pacify them the emperor allowed Atticus to restore John's name to the diptychs of Constantinople. This made it necessary for Atticus to justify his move to Cyril, which he does in two successive letters. From this correspondence it is clear that an uncanonical, illegitimate bishop was considered a non-bishop, and a deposed bishop was, of course, placed in this category, since the only alternative would be to judge his deposition illegitimate, with obvious and ineluctable consequences for his deposers and the one who replaced him. Atticus, who found himself in the latter predicament, argues cleverly that Chrysostom was restored to diptychal commemoration "not as a bishop, but as having formerly (πάλαι) been one."[9] In the earlier letter, Atticus had protested that he had done nothing against the canons or the Fathers.

> 1.For he [Chrysostom] is commemorated with the deceased, 2.not only with the bishops but also with priests and deacons and laymen and women, among whom not all have the priesthood in common with us, nor do they share the sacred ministry at the holy table. 3.For there is a great difference between the dead and those who still happen to be on earth, just as the books for ordering their commemoration are separate.[10]

Atticus also points out to Cyril that Antioch had recently included in its

[7] Whether this was first done by Alexander of Antioch (ca. 414-424) or his successor Theodotus (424-428) need not concern us here. Cf. NICEPHORUS CALLISTUS, HE XIV, 25-26, PG 146:1138-40; THEODORET OF CYRRHUS, EH V, 35:5, GCS 44 [19] Berlin 1954) 338.8-9.

[8] NICEPHORUS CALLISTUS, HE XIV, 26, PG 146:1140.

[9] *Ibid.* XIV, 26, PG 146:1141C.

[10] *Loc. cit.* PG 146:1141A.

diptychs the names of its "dissident" bishops Paulinus (362-381) and Evagrius (388-392/3), long after their demise, in order to content their supporters, and exhorts him to do the same in Egypt for Chrysostom.[11]

Cyril will have none of it. He replies:

> **4.**How can one defrocked from the priesthood be ordered among the priests of God and share their lot? How can one put out be included in the lists of the church ministers? ...**5.**How can you put a layman among the bishops...? **6.**Order the name of John to be removed from the list (κατάλογος) of bishops... 7.After Nectarius of renowned memory let the next place remain as is, **8.**and be kept that of the most pious Arsacius.[12]

The Nectarius (381-397) mentioned (**7**) was, of course, Chrysostom's predecessor as bishop of Constantinople; Arsacius (**8**) (404-405) was Chrysostom's interloping successor, whom Atticus himself succeeded in turn.

Theodoret (ca. 393-466), a native of Antioch like Chrysostom, and from 423 bishop of Cyrrhus, a small town in Euphratensis northeast of Antioch, recounts the dénoument of this affair in his *Church History* V, 34:12. The western Churches accepted communion with the eastern bishops only after all had restored Chrysostom's name to the diptychs of the dead *bishops* (ἕως ἐκείνου τοῦ θεσπεσίου ἀνδρὸς τοὔνομα τοῖς τεθνεῶσιν ἐπισκόποις συνέταξαν) – i.e., rejecting Atticus' waffling over just what list Chrysostom would be included in. Atticus himself was deemed worthy of the diptychal naming (πρόσρησις) only when he too had restored Chrysostom's name (τήν προσηγορίαν ἐγγράψαντα) to the diptychs of Constantinople,[13] a restoration confirmed by the Fifth Ecumenical Council, Constantinople II, in 553 under Justinian I (527-565).[14]

This story provides several precious details concerning the eastern liturgical diptychs near their time of origin:

1. The three major eastern sees, Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, all had diptychs.
2. These diptychs included the living and the dead in two separate books or lists (**3**).
3. In the case of dignitaries, at least, these diptychs were actual lists of proper names (**6-8**), not just general commemorations by category (sovereigns, hierarchs, priests, deacons, laity).

[11] *Loc. cit.* Cf. VAN DE PAVERD, *Meßliturgie* 353-5.
[12] *Ibid.* XXVII, PG 146:1144B/C, 1145D.
[13] GCS 44 [19] 336-7.
[14] ACO IV.1:13.20-30 = MANSI 9:183.

4. These lists of names must have been read aloud at the liturgy. Otherwise how would they have been a matter of public domain, something for the people to know and be agitated about?
5. The diptychs commemorated laity as well as clergy (2).
6. The commemorations were arranged according to separate categories: bishops, priests, deacons, laymen and women (**2, 4-6**).
7. At least in the diptychs of a patriarchal see like Constantinople, the dead bishops named were not just those of that local Church, but also of the patriarchal Churches with which it was in communion – otherwise why would Atticus exhort Cyril to include Chrysostom's name in the lists of Alexandria?
8. The lists had great significance as a symbol of mutual recognition and legitimacy not only in the present, but also retroactively, as a way of resolving past conflicts and rehabilitating bishops formerly out of favor.

II. Later Sources

Sources for the rite of Constantinople from the fifth through the thirteenth centuries confirm some of these details. In 450, Patriarch Anatolius (449-458) of Constantinople put his deposed and deceased predecessor Flavian (446-449) into the diptychs of the dead.[15]

A few years after, during the same interminable Monophysite controversy, in the strife over the *Henotikon* of Zeno (482) and the "Reunion Formula" of Pope Hormisdas (519), while Monophysites and Chalcedonians competed for the patriarchal throne of the Great Church, Patriarch Acacius' (472-479) name in the diptychs was the bone of contention. Eventually, all the patriarchs of Constantinople since Acacius were expunged from the lists for a time.[16]

1. *The Theotokos Commemoration*

One of the most important developments in the Constantinopolitan diptychs of the dead during this critcal post-Chalcedonian phase of the Monophysite sturggle was the interpolation of the Theotokos ekphonesis

[15] Reg 115a.
[16] EVERY 37-9. For a later Byzantine view, see PHOTIUS, PG 104:1219-22.

into the liturgy of Constantinople by Patriarch Gennadius I (458-471), at the command of Emperor Leo I (457-474), an innovation provoked by Patriarch Martyrius (459-470) of Antioch's refusal to grant Mary the Theotokos title.[17] Note that at that time, however, and indeed until the sixteenth century, this Marian ekphonesis introduced the diaconal diptychs of the dead, and not, as today, the chanting of a refrain in honor of the Mother of God, as we shall see in the *Excursus* in section B.VII at the end of this chapter.

Though we have no witness to the text of this ekphonesis before the earliest euchology ms, codex *Barberini 336*, its text thereafter is stable with the exception of the epithets, two of which, though witnessed to early, do not stabilize until much later. The textus receptus reads:

> Ἐξαιρέτως τῆς παναγίας ἀχράντου (ὑπερευλογημένης ἐνδόξου) δεσποίνης ἡμῶν θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας.

The two bracketed epithets are the weak links. Two mss, the oldest, *Barberini 336*,[18] and codex *Erlangen Misc. Gr. 96* (AD 1025) f. 16r, read ἀχράντου ὑπερενδόξου εὐλογημένης δεσποίνης. And although ἐνδόξου does have strong early witnesses in UrBAS[19] and in five sources of the old Constantinopolitan recension of CHR, CHR (but not BAS) of the tenth-century codex *Sevastianov 474*,[20] *Sinai Gr. 959* (11th c.), *961, 962* (11-12th c.),[21] and the twelfth-century *Paris Nouv. Acq. lat. 1791*,[22] as well as a few

[17] I believe the first one to note this liturgical innovation was F. DIEKAMP, *Analecta patristica. Texte und Abhandlungen zur griechischen Patristik* (OCA 117, Rome 1938) 68, citing THEODORE LECTOR, *Excerpta Vatopediana* no. 55, ed. A. PAPADOPOULOS-KERAMEUS, "Νέα τεμάχη τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας θεοδώρου Ἀναγνώστου τοῦ Ἐντολέως," *Žurnal Ministerstva Narodnago Prosveščenija* 70, Čast' 333, Otdel' klassičeskoj filologii (Janvar' 1901) 17 = *Epitome* 395, GCS 52:111; and E.W. BROOKS (ed.), *Historia ecclesiastica Zachariae Rhetori vulgo adscripta* IV, 11 (CSCO 83/87, scr. Syri, ser. 3, t. 5, Paris 1919, 1924) 185 (versio 128). I am grateful to F. van de Paverd for first drawing my attention to DIEKAMP.

[18] CHR, f. 32v = LEW 331.23-2; the defective text of BAS lacks the ekphonesis.

[19] DORESSE-LANNE 26-7.

[20] KS 264.

[21] WINKLER, "Interzessionen" I, 320.

[22] STRITTMATTER, "Missa Graecorum," 124.

later Italian mss,[23] the vast majority of the witnesses of all recensions of CHR throughout the ms tradition omit it,[24] and a few sources omit ὑπερευλογημένης too.[25]

The only other significant variant is in CHR of the eleventh-century euchology ms *Messina Gr. 160*, f. 36r, which reads: Ἐξαιρέτως γεννετρία τοῦ κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, although BAS of the same ms gives the incipit of the traditional text: Ἐξαιρέτως τῆς παναγ⟨ίας⟩ (f. 57v).

2. *The Synod of Constantinople in 518*

Especially interesting is the account of a synod held at Constantinople in 518, the acts of which are preserved in the acts of another synod held there, the Council of Constantinople in 536.[26] With the death of Patriarch Timothy I (511-518) on April 5, 518, followed not long after by that of Emperor Anastasius I (491-518) the night of July 9-10,[27] and the accession to the imperial throne immediately thereafter of the Orthodox emperor Justin I (518-527), the stage was set for the restoration of Chalcedonian Orthodoxy. On July 16, during the synodal ses-

[23] The 13th c. roll *British Library Harl. 5561, Ambros. 276 (E 20 sup.)* 25r; 15th c. *Ambros. 637 (P 112 sup.)* 26v; 16th c. *Modena 19* f. 14v.

[24] The 10th c. *Sevastianov 474* (BAS), *Leningrad 226*, KS 264, 291; 11th c. *Stavrou 109, Paris Gr. 391* f. 24v, *Grott. Gb XX* f. 24r, *Parma 1217/2 (H.H.I.1)*; 12th c. *Sinai Gr. 973* (AD 1153) f. 9r, *Grott. Gb II* (BAS) f. 35r, *Munich 607, Seymour Euchology* f. 34r, *Oxford Bodleian Add. E.12* and *Auct. E.5.13* f. 18r, *Paris Gr. 328* p. 54, *347* p. 89, *Paris Coislin 214* f. 12r; 12-13th c. roll *Vallicelliana Gr. 112 (G 70), Sinai Gr. 1036* f. 38r; 13th c. *Bodleian Cromwell 11* (AD 1225) p. 40, *Sinai Gr. 966* f. 32r; 13-14th c. *Taphou 520*; 14th c. *Taphou 517, Moscow Synod Gr. 261 (279)* KS 301, *Ambros. 1090 (Z 257 sup.)*; 15th c. *Iviron 373 (780)* (AD 1400) f. 9r, *Sinai Gr. 968* (AD 1426) f. 14r, *British Library Add. 18070, Istanbul Patriarchal Library Panaghia Kamariotissa 87 (90)* (AD 1475) f. 19r, *141 (144)* f. 23v, *142 (145)* f. 30v, *143 (146)* f. 20v, *Geneva 24*, and BAS in *Geneva 25, 27, 27A*; 15-16th c. *Sabas 382* f. 30r, *Sabas 48* (AD 1537) f. 43r, *Istanbul Patriarchal Library Panaghia Kamariotissa 139 (142)* (AD 1551) f. 12v; etc. See also a couple of later, insignificant variants in TREMPELAS 116.

[25] The 10th c. *Sevastianov 474* (CHR, not BAS, which has it) KS 264, *Grott. Gb VII*, PASSARELLI 75; 13th c. *Ambros. 709 (R 24 sup.)* f. 93v.

[26] ACO III, 71-76.

[27] C. CAPIZZI, *L'imperatore Anastasio I (491-518). Studio sulla sua vita, la sua opera e la sua personalità* (OCA 184, Rome 1969) 258.

sion in the Great Church, the pro-Chalcedonian populace forced the newly elected (April 17, 518) Patriarch John II Cappodax (518-520) to proclaim the four ecumenical councils, Nicea I (325), Constantinople I (381), Ephesus (431), and Chalcedon (451), in the diptychs:

> 1.When [the people] closed the very doors [of Hagia Sophia] and kept up the same outcries [demanding the inclusion of the councils in the diptychs], 2.the most holy and blessed archbishop and ecumenical patriarch John, taking the diptychs, ordered the four holy synods of the holy Fathers assembled in Nicea, and of those likewise gathered in Constantinople under Nectarius of pious memory, and of those in Ephesus...and of those in Chalcedon...3.and the names of the deceased former archbishops of this imperial city, Euphemius and Macedonius of pious memory, 4.and of course of Leo too, late archbishop of Rome, 5.to be put in order [in the diptychs].[28]

This (1-2) meant, undoubtedly, a commemoration, in traditional form, "of the 318 fathers of Nicea I, of the 150 fathers of Constantinople I, of the 650 fathers gathered in Chalcedon" etc. This is what we find in the hagiopolite diptychs of the dead, extant in two codices, *Sinai Gr. 1040* from ca. 1166, cited above in chapter III, section A.I, and the same text with but few variants in the unedited fourteenth-century text of Greek JAS in *Sinai Gr. 1039* (f. 71r-v). Note, however, that these are *hagiopolite* diptychs for use in JAS, not *Constantinopolitan* lists for CHR and BAS. Similarly, Nestorian diptychs pray "for the commemoration of our holy fathers the 318 bishops gathered in the city of Nicea to confirm the true faith," and the Mesopotamian Jacobite *Book of Life* has the mention of "the three councils, Nicea, Constantinople, Ephesus, with the rest of the councils," i.e., the councils those communions recognize.[29]

3. *Maximus Confessor*

Maximus Confessor († 662) in his *Scholia on Ps.-Dionysius' Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* III, 2, speaks of two sets of Byzantine diptychs, and

[28] ACO III, 76. On the communication of this decision to other churches and their reception of it, see C.J. HEFELE, H. LECLERCQ, *Histoire des conciles d'après les documents originaux* II.2 (Paris 1908) 1046-53.

[29] FIEY, "Diptyques," 383. As Fiey notes (384), this introduces a confessional element of faith-profession to the namings in the diptychs. We discussed these texts above in chapter III, section C.I.

notes that, unlike the diptychs described by Dionysius, they were not found in the preanaphora.[30]

More positively, the May 655 protocol recounting Maximus' testimony at his trial in the imperial palace has Maximus arguing against the common Byzantine imperial delusion that emperors are the equivalent of priests. After enumerating what emperors cannot do – celebrate the eucharist, baptize, chrismate, impose hands (ordain), dedicate a church, wear the omophorion, etc.[31] – Maximus adds:

> 1.During the holy anaphora at the holy altar 2.the emperor is commemorated 3.with the laity, 4.after the bishops and deacons and the whole priestly order, 5.when the deacon says: "*And for all the laity who have fallen asleep in faith, Constantine, Constantius, and the rest.*" 6.And in like manner he also commemorates the living emperors, after all the sacred ministers.[32]

Here we see:

1. Byzantine diptychs of both the dead (**5**) and the living (**6**)
2. proclaimed by the deacon (**5**)
3. in that order (**5-6**)
4. and during the anaphora (**1**)
5. with only the emperors actually *named* in the commemorations of the laity (**2, 5**). At least that is what I presume Maximus to mean. When speaking of the deceased laity he mentions only the emperors by name (**5**), and asserts that the commemorations of the dead and of the living took place "in like manner" (**6**).

Further on in the same account, we learn that Maximus refused communion with the Church of Constantinople as long as the deceased Constantinopolitan patriarchs Sergius (610-638), Pyrrhus (638-641), and Paul (641-653), Monothelites condemned at the Lateran Council in 649, were

[30] PG 4:136D, cited and analyzed in chapter VI at the beginning of section B.II.

[31] *Relatio motionis*, Acta I, 4, PG 90:117B. On this document and its date, see chapter I note 33.

[32] *Ibid.* Acta I, 5, PG 90:117D: Εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν ἀναφορὰν ἐπὶ τῆς ἁγίας τραπέζης, μετὰ τοὺς ἀρχιερέας καὶ διάκονους, καὶ παντὸς ἱερατικοῦ τάγματος, μετὰ τῶν λαικῶν οἱ βασιλεῖς μνημονεύονται, λέγοντος τοῦ διακόνου: *Καὶ τῶν ἐν πίστει κεκοιμημένων λαϊκῶν, Κωνσταντίνου, Κώνσταντος, καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς.* Οὕτω δὲ καὶ τῶν ζώντων μνημονεύει βασιλέων, μετὰ τοὺς ἱερωμένους πάντας.

named in the diptychs of the departed during the holy anaphora: "ἀναφερομένων τῶν ἀναθεματισθέντων ἐπὶ τῆς ἁγίας ἀναφορᾶς."[33]

And so it went at Constantinople right up until 1285, when, in the last reference I have uncovered, the deceased unionist Emperor Michael VIII Paleologus (1259-1282) was refused Christian burial and expunged from the diptychs of the dead.[34]

B. THE LITURGICAL SOURCES

As we saw in chapter I, section C.I, the diaconal diptychs of the departed in the Byzantine eucharist came immediately after the presiding celebrant's ekphonesis (Ἐξαιρέτως...) commemorating the Theotokos in BAS and CHR. But in actual usage, the proclamation aloud of the diptychs of the dead begins its decline into disuse around the second half of the eleventh century, as Gabriele Winkler has shown in her study of the relative rubrics in the euchology mss.[35] Despite the continued presence in later sources of the rubric ordering the proclamation of the diptychs,[36] it appears that after this period the deacon commemorated the dead silently, though it is only in the twelfth-century Latin version of codex *Paris Nouv. Acq. lat. 1791* that a euchology rubric tells us so explicitly: *Diaconus tacite tabulas mortuorum afferat.*[37]

I. The Protheoria

One of the last explicitly liturgical sources to witness to the actual use of both sets of diptychs, of the dead and of the living, is the *Protheoria*,[38] a

[33] *Rel. motionis*, Acta I, 17, PG 90:153CD; cf. VAN DE PAVERD, *Meßliturgie* 512. Regarding ἀναφέρω as a technical term for proclaiming the diptychal commemorations, see chapter I, section B.

[34] Reg 1489.

[35] WINKLER, "Interzessionen," I, 324-25, 332-36; II, 381.

[36] LEW 388:6-9.

[37] STRITTMATTER, "Missa Graecorum," 124-5, with the retroversion, Ὁ διάκονος μυστικῶς τὰ δίπτυχα τῶν κεκοιμημένων, which does not take account of the verb "afferat," probably ἀναφέρει or λαμβάνει in the original: cf. chapter I note 34.

[38] PG 140:417-68.

liturgical commentary from Andida in Pamphilia Secunda in the second half of the eleventh century, written by Nicholas of Andida and later revised by Theodore of Andida.[39] This provincial text, however, is careful to affirm its adherence to the uses of the Great Church, and can be taken to reflect mainline Byzantine usage of the epoch.[40]

The text describes a pontifical liturgy presided over by an archbishop. After mentioning in chapter 29 the ekphonesis commemorating the Theotokos, customary incipit of the diptychs of the dead, *Protheoria* 30 continues:[41]

> Then, while the deacon whispers softly the diptychs of the dead (Εἶτα τοῦ διακόνου τὰ δίπτυχα ὑποψιθυρίζοντος τῶν κεκοιμημένων), the bishop again prays, beginning the commemoration of the New Testament saints...

The text then comments on the sanctoral commemorations as presented by both CHR and BAS: the Old and New Testament saints (= CHR, for in BAS they precede the Theotokos ekphonesis[42]), John the Baptist (= CHR-BAS[43]), those for whom offerings are made (= BAS[44]), etc.:

> After the commemoration of the above mentioned apostles and saints, comes the list (κατάλογος) of the dead commemorated, and those for whom offerings [are made], and the priests and emperors and everyone else.

In *Protheoria* 33, the customary Ἐν πρώτοις ekphonesis for the archbishop opens the diptychs of the living, after which the same chapter continues: "After these exclamations the diptychs of the living, i.e., of the bishops, the emperors, and the rest, are said, with the deacon proclaiming them aloud." So the *Protheoria* confirms what Winkler observed in the euchology ms tradition: though the diptychs of the living continued in use, by the eleventh century the diptychs of the dead were no longer proclaimed aloud.[45]

[39] On this work and its authors, see BORNERT, *Commentaires* 181-206. Bornert (181-96) dates the commentary between 1055-63. This has been challenged by J. DARROUZÈS, "Nicolas d'Andida et les azymes," REB 32 (1974) 199-203, who situates it between 1085-95.

[40] PG 140:444. Cf. BORNERT, *Commentaires* 199-200.

[41] The *Protheoria* texts discussed in this section are found in PG 140:456C-7A, 460C-1A.

[42] LEW 330-331.

[43] LEW 331.

[44] LEW 332.

[45] See note 35 above.

II. Diptychal Remnants in the Liturgical Sources

1. *The Version of Leo Tuscan*

The relevant rubrics, though with no diaconal text, for the Constantinopolitan diptychs of the dead are found in the Latin version of CHR made between 1173-1178 by Leo Tuscan of Pisa, translator of the imperial chancellery. The translation was made at the request of Raymond of Montcada, a Catalan nobleman in Constantinople on an embassy ca. 1173, during the reign of Manuel I Comnenus (1143-1180).[46]

> *Exaltat* [*sacerdos*] *uocem*: Precipue autem sanctissima, intemerata, superbenedicta regina nostra, dei genetrice et semper uirgine Maria.
>
> *Hic autem qui stat in choro post sanctum altare diaconus, qui fecerat continuatam orationem,*[47] *pronuntiat*: Et pro uniuersorum cogitationibus ut deo placeant exoremus.
>
> *Clerus et populus*: Et pro omnium et uniuersorum.
>
> *Diaconus interea suggerit ut pro defunctis fiat oratio.*[48]

This Latin text suggests the following retroversion: after the Marian ekphonesis, the deacon in the sanctuary, standing behind the altar, exclaims: Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος κατὰ διάνοιαν ἔχει, ἵνα τῷ θεῷ εὐαρεστῶσι[49] δεηθῶμεν, to which the clergy and people respond together: Καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν. Then the deacon reads the list of names to be prayed for. He probably did this to himself. For we have seen that by the end of the eleventh century in Constantinopolitan and Italian usage the diptychs of the dead were no longer proclaimed aloud.

Though Tuscan seems to imply that this exclamation introduced

[46] Jacob, "Toscan," 112-4.

[47] Tuscan's version mentions several deacons: the archdeacon; the first deacon who read the gospel, the second who chanted the orationem sine intermissione, i.e., the ektene litany following the gospel; the third who chanted the next litany, for the catechumens; and "the others (reliqui)": Jacob, "Toscan," 149 no. **XIV**. I suspect that the deacon mentioned here is the one who chanted the Great Synapte or opening litany of the service, probably the archdeacon: "*Dum uero diaconus facit peticiones has continuatim...*" Jacob (*ibid.* 138 no. **III**), however, puts a comma before *continuatim*.

[48] *Ibid.* 155.

[49] This, at least, is the verb *ApConst* VIII, 12:43 uses in the anaphoral intercessions for the "saints agreeable to you" – i.e. to God: εὐαρεστησάντων σοι ἁγίων (SC 336:202).

the lists, it actually concluded them, as the sources adduced and interpreted by Winkler abundantly demonstrate,[50] and as one can infer from the mss and from the Melkite *qundaq* cited in the following sections of this chapter. No argument against this can be adduced from the fact that the diaconal exclamation precedes the diptychs of the dead in the tenth-century codex *Grottaferrata Gb IV* (f. 23v), for in this text the diptychs are out of place, as I shall show when we treat this later in this same section.

Eventually, however, this finale gets detached from its original *Sitz im Leben* in the diptychs of the dead and appears henceforth, especially in the pontifical liturgy, as an introduction to the diptychs of the living![51]

Since the καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν phrase is found also in the hagiopolite diptychs of JAS,[52] and, Edmund Bishop thought, in Egypt too, he took it to be Formelgut.[53] I consider that unlikely. For the phrase is not found, as Bishop thought, in Egypt in the *Luxor Diptych*.[54] And its absence in all other text-traditions makes it more likely a Byzantinism that JAS borrowed from BAS/CHR.

If only *ad complementum doctrinae*, one might note the somewhat similar Latin phrase, "Ipsis et omnibus...," which concluded the reading of the nomina from the diptychs (tabulae) in the Roman *Canon Missae* (anaphora) according to Florus of Lyons († ca. 860), *Opusculum de expositione missae* 70.[55]

2. *The Euchology and Diataxis Manuscripts*

Even after the eleventh century, when the public proclamation of the diptychs of the dead had become obsolete, in some areas the practice of the deacon actually reading the names of the dead recorded in the official diptychs of the Church continued at least at the pontifical liturgy, albeit in

[50] "Interzessionen" II, 367-77. See also ORLOV 242-3.

[51] See also section B.V. of the next chapter.

[52] Nos. **14-15** of the text cited in chapter III, section A.I.

[53] "Comments" III, 17-2.

[54] Text cited in chapter III, section D.IV.3.

[55] PL 119:62CD. Cf. E. BISHOP, "On the Early Texts of the Roman Canon," JTS 4 (1903) 572.

silence. The fourteenth-century Slavonic *činovnik* ms *Vatican Slav. 9* gives after the Marian ekphonesis this rubric:

> The deacon standing on the right side and makes the remembrances, saying: he reads through the books in which are written the name of the Tsars gone before us to their rest, and the archbishops and all who are written down in the Holy Catholic (*s''bor'nouju*) Church; and this, however, he reads silently (*tixo*).[56]

Long after the relegation of the nomina to silent recitation, euchology, archieratikon, and diataxis mss continue to preserve as a remnant of the diptychs of the dead the concluding diaconal exclamation reported by Tuscan. A typical example is the rubric after the priest's Marian ekphonesis in the thirteenth-fourteenth century diataxis in codex *Moscow Synod Gr. 381 (275)*: Ὁ διάκονος τὰ δίπτυχα τῶν κεκοιμημένων καθ' ἑαυτὸν πρώτον ἀναγνοὺς λέγει Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος κατὰ διάνοιαν ἔχει, καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.[57]

The variants in the sources are not important. Some mss abbreviate further the καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος, giving only the finale of the finale, καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.[58] Other sources, like some mss of Patriarch (1353-1354, 1364-1376) Philotheus Kokkinos' (ca. 1300-†1379) definitive diataxis,[59] a ceremonial book or manual of rubrics, and the contemporary euchology ms of Athens, *Ethn. Bibl. 716*,[60] include the exclamation only if a bishop is celebrating, according to the rubric they give following the Marian ekphonesis: Καὶ εἴπερ λειτουργεῖ καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐκφωνεῖ τότε εὐθὺς ὁ διάκονος: Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος. Most

[56] KS 155.

[57] KM 27. See also the exhaustive list of mss sources in WINKLER, "Interzessionen" II, 368-73.

[58] *Loc. cit.*

[59] As in the edition of KM 66, based on three sixteenth-century Athonite mss, *Panteleimon 421* (AD 1545) and *435*, and *Vatopedi 133 (744)*. Note, however, that the oldest ms, practically contemporary with the work, the codex *Panteleimon 770* (TREMPELAS 12), suppresses the exclamation entirely. I call Philotheus' diataxis "definitive" because his rubrics, composed when he was still hegumen of the Great Lavra on Mt. Athos (see note 67 below), became quasi-official during his patriarchate, were ultimately incorporated into the editio princes of Doukas (Rome 1526), and have remained the basis of the official rubrics to this day. On the diataxis in general, and Philotheus and his diataxis in particular, see TAFT, *Great Entrance* xxxvi-vii; ID., "Mt. Athos," 192-4.

[60] TREMPELAS 116.

sources do not impose this this restriction, however, which cannot be considered traditional.

And, as one would expect from the always more free-wheeling Italo-Byzantine tradition, several mss of Italian provenance offer variations on the theme, having the deacon do the incipit of the exclamation and the people or choir respond, Καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν[61] – or even the opposite, with the deacon responding to the choir, as in *Modena 19* f. 15v, from the beginning of the sixteenth century.

But the overwhelming majority of ms sources are content to simply leave in its customary place, right after the Marian ekphonesis, the old rubric for the diptychs of the dead – most commonly, Ὁ διάκονος (λέγει[62]) τὰ δίπτυχα τῶν κεκοιμημένων,[63] or simply τὰ δίπτυχα[64] τῶν κεκοιμημένων.[65]

III. The Degeneration of the Diptychs

1. *The Euchologies and Diataxeis*

Eventually, however, the diaconal lists degenerate into a silent anaphoral remembrance of the dead, and are ultimately confused with the anaphoral intercessions for the departed recited by the priest. We see the

[61] *Ambros. 167 (C 7 sup.)* f. 90r (14th c.), and *84 (B 15 sup.) f. 29r* (15th c.).

[62] Add *Sinai Gr. 2017* (AD 1570) f. 24r; *Ambros. 637 (P 112 sup.)* (15th c.) f. 18r read λαμβάνει. Or some other variant such as Καὶ λέγοντος τοῦ διακόνου τὰ δ. τῶν κ. ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπεύχεται: 12th c. *Bodleian Auct. E.5.13* (BAS) f. 31r, *Munich 607*; 15th c. rolls *Geneva 24* and *27A* (BAS); etc.

[63] The 10th c. *Sevastianov 474* and *Leningrad 226* (KS 264, 291); 11th c. *Stavrou 109, Paris Gr. 391* f. 25r; 11-12th c. *Sinai Gr. 961* BAS f. 12v; 12th c. *Paris Gr. 328* p. 55, *Paris Coislin 214* p. 89; 12-13th c. *Sinai Gr. 1036*, f. 38r; 14th c. *Taphou 517, Moscow Synod Gr. 261 (279)* (KS 301); 15th c. *Sinai Gr. 968* (AD 1426) f. 14v, BAS of rolls *Geneva 25* and *27A*; 16th c. *Sabas 48* (AD 1537) f. 43v, *Sinai Gr. 2045* (AD 1572) BAS f. 63r, and *2111* (AD 1594); 17th c. *Taphou 334* f. 32v; etc. Cf. Winkler, "Interzessionen" II, 345-8.

[64] Codex *Erlangen Misc. Gr. 96* (AD 1025) f. 16v.

[65] The 11-12th c. *Vat. Gr. 1170*; 13th c. *Vat. Gr. 1228*, KS 141, 148, *Ambrose 709 (R 24 sup.)* f. 94r; 14th c. *Ambros. 167 (C 7 sup.)* f. 27r; 15th c. *Istanbul Patriarchal Library Panaghia Kamariotissa 142 (145)* f 30v and *143 (146)* f. 20v.

beginning of this in a rubric in some Greek euchology and diataxis mss, instructing the deacon to recall to himself the dead he wishes to pray for:

> Καὶ ὅταν ἐκφωνήσῃ ὁ ἱερεὺς τὸ Ἐξαιρέτως τῆς παναγίας, μνεμονεύει ὁ διάκονος τοῦ τε ἡγουμένου καὶ τῆς ἀδελφότητος καὶ ἑτέρων ζώντων ὧν βούλεται καθ' ἑαυτόν.

This rubric is probably of monastic origin. We find it first in the diataxis of Philotheus,[66] an Athonite rubric book composed before 1347, when Philotheus was still hegumen of the Great Lavra on Mt. Athos, as the text itself informs us.[67] This rubric in one form or another is found in other mss of the epoch.[68]

This metamorphosis of the diaconal lists into a silent memento of the dead paralleling that of the priest reaches the point in some ms sources[69] where it develops, after the rubric for the diptychs, formulas for the remembrance, usually Μνήσθητι, Κύριε, τὴν ψυχὴν/τὰς ψυχὰς τοῦ δοῦλου/τῆς δούλης/τῶν δούλων τοῦ θεοῦ/τοῦ δοῦλου σου N., in imitation of the anaphoral formulas for the commemoration of the living in CHR and BAS.[70] Sometimes one or more names accompany these formulas,[71] or one finds only the names themselves, often scribbled either in the margin, as in CHR of the eleventh-twelfth century codex *Sinai Gr. 961* (f. 14v), or in a blank space the copyist has deliberately left for them to be written in by a later hand, as in the eleventh-century codex *Grottaferrata Gb XV* (f. 8r), the twelfth-century *Seymour Euchology* (ff. 33v-34r) at Yale, etc.

But by this time the confusion between the now silent diptychs and parallel anaphoral intercessions for the dead is complete, and one finds the rubric for the diaconal diptychs and sometimes even such formulas and/or names not only at the traditional place of the diptychs of the dead, after Ἐξαιρέτως, but even after the Ἐν πρώτοις ekphonesis opening the

[66] TREMPELAS 12; KM 66; codex *Sinai Gr. 2046* (14-15th c.) f. 19v.

[67] TREMPELAS 1.

[68] E.g. *Sabas 382* (15-16th c.) f. 30r.

[69] E.g. 10th c. *Grott. Gb II* (BAS) f. 35r; 11th c. *Parma 1217/2 (H.H.I.1); 11-12th c. Vatican Gr. 1170* (KS 148); 12th c. *Seymour Euchology* = Yale University *Codex Beinecke 139* ff. 33v-34r (formula repeated twice here, and again, by the priest, after τάγματος; cf. note 77 below), *Paris Gr. 347* p. 89 (in margin).

[70] LEW 332-6.

[71] *Loc. cit.* above in note 69.

diptychs of the living,[72] or confused with the priest's intercession, after προσώπου σου in the prayers for the dead.[73]

The earliest sign of this new development is found, again, in Southern Italy, in the tenth-century codex *Grottaferrata Gb IV*, a ms of the ancient Italo-Greek redaction of CHR. This ms (f. 23v) has the diaconal finale Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος κατὰ διάνοιαν ἔχει καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν, *before* the rubric Καὶ τὰ δίπτυχα τῶν κεκοιμημένων, followed in turn by six lines of names (now scraped away) of the departed to be read for commemoration *by the priest*. The same is found in BAS (f. 11v), where even the diaconal finale is said by the priest. In this codex and in several later Italo-Greek witnesses,[74] the diptychs have been displaced until the end of the priest's anaphoral commemoration of the dead,[75] hence following the (formerly) diaconal Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος..., and have fused with the anaphoral intercession of the priest, so that they are really no longer diptychs except in name.[76]

By the time this evolution has come to term, some mss, indeed, show a complete confusion between the silent diptychs/intercessions for the living and dead, even placing the commemoration of deceased bishops after τάγματος, in the commemoration of the hierarchy during the anaphoral intercessions for the living.[77] Others mingle the once-separate diaconal commemorations of the living and dead together, as in the fifteenth-century Italo-Greek codex *Ambros. 84 (B 15 sup.)* (f. 89r), where we find after the Marian ekphonesis this rubric which has also contaminated later mss[78] and the textus receptus in the printed editions:[79]

[72] Oxford codex *Bodleian Cromwell 11* (AD 1225) pp. 41-42. 68.

[73] LEW 332.5. Cf. 10th c. *Leningrad Gr. 226* (KS 292); 11th c. *Grott. Zd II* f. 71r, *Messina Gr. 160* ff. 37r, 57v; 11-12th c. *Sinai Gr. 961* BAS f. 42r; 12th c. *Sinai Gr. 973* (AD 1153) f. 9r; 12-13th c. roll *Vallicelliana Gr. 112 (G 70)*; 13th c. *Ambros. 709 (R 24 sup.)* f. 94r, *Sinai Gr. 966* BAS f. 42r; 14th c. *Ambros. 167 (C 7 sup.)* f. 29r.

[74] Winkler, "Interzessionen," II, 345-9.

[75] I.e. after LEW 388.27.

[76] Winkler II, 345-51.

[77] LEW 332.12 (right). Cf. 13th c. *Seymour Euchology* f. 35r.

[78] *Sinai Gr. 1919* (AD 1564) f. 44v; 17th c. *Taphou 334* (BAS) f. 82r.

[79] LEW 388; Hieratikon (Rome 1950) 136, 197; (Athens 1962) 136, 186, etc.

Ὁ διάκονος θυμιᾷ γυρόθεν τὴν ἁγίαν τράπεζαν καὶ τὰ δίπτυχα λέγων· Θεοτόκε Παρθένε, Χαῖρε κεκαιριτομένη.[80] Καὶ μνημονεύει τῶν κεκοιμημένων *καὶ τῶν ζώντων* ὧν βούλεται.

Similar developments are observable in the Greek and Slavonic mss of BAS,[81] though in general the in some respects more conservative Slavonic *služebnik* and diataxis mss persist in retaining the diaconal diptychs separate, and in their correct location, even if they are done in silence.[82]

2. *The "Diptych" of Cozza-Luzi*

One unidentified Byzantine euchology ms, from which an anaphoral excerpt of CHR was published as a "diptych" by Giuseppe Cozza-Luzi, is to be interpreted in this context. Cozza-Luzi tells us, with the maddening insouciance of scholarly references in those nonchalant days, "Invenio in Euchologio Mss. antiquitate vetustissimo immediate ante Ἔτι παρακαλοῦμεν σε μνήσθητι..." – i.e., right after the incipit of the anaphoral intercession for the dead in CHR[83] – the following list:

Ὁ ἱερεὺς ἄρχεται τὰ δίπτυχα τῶν κεκοιμημένων χριστιάνων. Μνήσθητι κύριε τοῦ δούλου σου Βασιλείου. Μνήσθητι κύριε τοῦ δούλου σου Κοσμᾶ ἱερομονάχου καὶ...μνήσθητι κύριε τοῦ δούλου σου Δανιὴλ ἱερέως καὶ... [and there follow the names of ca. thirty laypersons, first men, then women].[84]

In spite of the use of the term "diptychs" in the very text, these are not diptychs but a list of names for the priest's *memento* of the departed during the anaphoral intercessions. The very fact that the priest, not the deacon, reads the names betrays that.

[80] On the interpolation of Marian troparia here, see the *Excursus* below in section B.VII at the end of this chapter.

[81] Orlov 222-3.

[82] Cf. the *služebnik* and diataxis in the 15th c. *Vatican Slav. 14*, KS 165, 188; and the later (17th c.?) *Sinai Slav. 14* (f. 26r-v), *15* (ff. 36r-37r, 63r, 66v), *40* (roll).

[83] LEW 332.6.

[84] Cozza-Luzi, "De sacris collybis et diptychis," 142.

IV. An Italo-Greek Diptych

To the several "Italo-Greek peculiarities" de Meester, Strittmatter, Jacob, Winkler, and others have noted in Byzantine liturgical mss from Magna Graecia one can add the diaconal proclamation found just before the Ἐν πρώτοις ekphonesis – one more instance of the displacement of the diptychs of the dead in Southern Italy – in three euchology codices of the eleventh (*Messina Gr. 160, Grottaferrata Gb XV*) and early twelfth century (*Oxford Bodleian Auct. E.5.13 [Graec. misc. 78]*). *Messina 160* is a ms of the ancient Italo-Greek recension of CHR, similar to *Grottaferrata Gb IV* and, probably, *Grottaferrata Gb XV*.[85] *Bodleian Auct. E.5.13* ia a Siculo-Calabrian euchology of the new Constantinopolitan recension of CHR.[86] The Bodleian ms is from the Byzantine Monastery of SS. Salvatore (St. Savior), built "in Lingua Phari," i.e., where the Fort of SS. Salvatore is now located, at the tip of the peninsula that juts out like a tongue to enclose the Port of Messina, in the decade between 1121/2-1131. The ms, written in the calligraphy of Reggio Calabria, Jacob dates from around the time of the foundation of the monastery.[87] *Messina 160* (CHR f. 38r; cf. BAS f. 60r) gives only the incipit Ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν γῇ καὶ ἐν δουλείᾳ καὶ ἐν δ⟨ιαφόροις⟩. *Grottaferrata Gb XV*, CHR (f. 9r) gives only Καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν θαλάσσῃ, whereas BAS (f. 30v) and the Bodleian ms (f. 19r-v) have the full text, which I give below from the latter, with variants:

> **Ὁ διάκονος**· Καὶ [om. Mess] ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν γῇ [Gr πολέμοις] καὶ ἐν θαλάσσῃ [Mess δουλείᾳ] καὶ ἐν διαφόροις τόποις τελειωθέντων χριστιανῶν

[85] JACOB, *Formulaire* 184-91; S. PARENTI, "Osservazioni sul testo dell'Anafora di Giovanni Crisostomo in alcuni eucologi italo-greci (VIII-XI secolo)," EL 105 (1991) 120-154, here 124.

[86] LEW 543. On the penetration of the new Constantinopolitan recension of CHR (cf. TAFT, *Great Entrance* xxxi-ii) into the region of Reggio Calabria and Northeast Sicily in the 12th c., see JACOB, *Formulaire* 386ff; and on this Bodleian codex, *ibid.* 388, and especially ID., "Euchologe."

[87] JACOB, "Euchologe," 286-8. On Italo-Greek monasticism in Sicily the classic study remains M. SCADUTO, *Il monachesimo basiliano nella Sicilia medievale. Rinascita a decadenza, sec. XI-XIV* (Storia e letteratura. Raccolti di studi e testi 18, Rome 1982); on S. Salvatore, see 165-243, and esp. M.B. FOTI, *Il Monastero del S.mo Salvatore in Lingua Phari. Proposte scrittorie e coscienza culturale* (Messina 1989) 9-119; cf. JACOB, "Euchologe," 286-7. The Typikon of S. Salvatore has been edited by ARRANZ, *Typicon*.

ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος κατὰ διάνοιαν ⟨ἔχει, καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.⟩

Ὁ λαός· Καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.[88]

The Italo-Greek or "Basilian" monasteries where these mss were written belonged to the Byzantine Rite community of Magna Graecia, whose cloisters were often repopulated by exiled monks from the Orthodox monasteries of the Middle East, fleeing, in successive waves, from the Persians, from Heraclius' persecution of the Monophysites, from the advancing armies of Islam, and from Iconoclasm. So this anguished cry, especially from S. Salvatore, monastery of a great port city whose population knew the meaning of death in far-off exile or by shipwreck at sea, is as understandable as it is poignant. It cannot, however, be taken as representative of more than local usage of the time.

V. The Editio Princeps of the Melkite Qundāq

One late source presents some further surprises: the 1701 Melkite editio princeps of the Arabic liturgikon or *qundāq* (from κοντάκιον)[89] prepared under Athanasius IV Dabbas, patriarch of Antioch (1685-1694, 1720-1724) during his exile in Wallachia,[90] and printed thanks to the patronage of Constantin Brâncoveanu Basarab, Prince of Wallachia (1688-1714). The printing was effected by the Snagov Monastery press, the first in Romania, established in 1643 by Mateu Basarab, likewise Prince of Wallachia (1632-1654).[91] This text provides the following. At the Marian

[88] Since I read and transcribed the ms in 1972, the text cited here has been edited in JACOB, "Euchologe," 304.

[89] *Kitāb al-quddāsāt aṭ-ṭalāṭat al-ilāhīya...* in both Greek and Arabic: E. LEGRAND, *Bibliographie hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par des grecs au dix-huitième siècle* I (Paris 1918) 1-9. Cf. KOROLEVSKY, "Le rite byzantin," 539-60; ID., *Histoire* III, 55-72; GRAF I, 633.

[90] Cf. FEDALTO II, 686. Athanasius was dispossessed in favor of Cyril V az-Za'īm (1672, 1682-1720), grandson of Patriarch Macarius II ibn az-Za'īm (whom we shall meet again below in chapter V, section B.III.3): see the references to KOROLEVSKY in the previous note.

[91] The Snagov Monastery still exists on the island of the same name, 40 km. north of Bucharest. Cf. N. ŞERBĂNESCU, *Istoria mînăsterii Snagov* (Bucharest 1944);

ekphonesis, Ἐξαιρέτως, there are no diptychs of the dead in what should be their customary place. But just before the Ἐν πρώτοις ekphonesis introducing the diptychs of the *living*, there is this diaconal diptych *of the departed*, all in Arabic except for the traditional finale, given, as here, in Greek:

> *The deacon says the diptychs of the dead:* For our most holy, pure, blessed, glorious Lady the Mother of God and ever-virgin Mary, for the honorable and glorious prophet and precurser John the Baptist, for the two holy, honorable and most glorious apostles [Peter and Paul], for our venerable, God-bearing fathers, for the holy protomartyr and archdeacon Stephen, and for all the saints, through the protection of whose prayers deign to hear our supplication and have pity on us, O God.
>
> Again let us pray for all the departed of eternal memory, who built this holy sanctuary, and for all our departed fathers and brothers buried here, for all Orthodox Christians everywhere, καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος κατὰ διάνοιαν ἔχει, καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.[92]

As Korolevsky rightly remarks, this text is a mélange of material lifted from the prothesis commemorations in the same source and, in part, from the common tradition,[93] demonstrating once again the fluctuating character of, and mutual borrowings and contamination among, the liturgical commemorations genre. This text is a hapax, the only modern Byzantine Rite text for the diaconal diptychs of the departed known to me,[94] and there is no basis for considering it a reflection of earlier tradition,

V. Brătulescu, "Mînăstirea Snagov," *Biserica Ortodoxă Romînă* 72 no. 2-3 (1954) 258-82; id., Mânăstirea Snagovul. Extras din *Rivista Şeoala şi Viaţa Ilfovului* (Bucharest, n.d.), C. Diaconovich (ed.), *Enciclopedia română* (Sibiu 1904) III, 976; E. Th. Moudopoulos, "Σναγόβου, μονή," *Θρησκευτικὴ καὶ θικὴ ἐγκυκλοπαιδεία* 11 (Athens 1969) 258-9.

[92] *Kitāb* 144, cited from Korolevsky, "Le rite byzantin," 552; id., *Histoire* III, 64.

[93] "Le rite byzantin," 552, cf. 548; id., *Histoire* 64, cf. 13-14; cf. LEW 357:28-30; 357:2-2, 8, 20, 35-6.

[94] Korolevsky twice asserts ("Le rite byzantin," 559-60, *Histoire* III, 71) that this edition is an exact copy of the 1663 Venice Greek euchology, which, in turn, "was copied word for word by that of 1727, which served as prototype for the Roman edition of the three liturgies, done in 1738." But none of the sources listing the Greek liturgical books published at Venice mention a 1663 euchology, though Legrand is known to be incomplete, and I will not pretend to have made an exhaustive search for it: E. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par des grecs au dix-septième siècle* II (Paris 1894) 148-84;. A. Raes, "Les livres liturgiques grecs publiés à Venise," in: *Mélanges E. Tis-*

or as evidence of the original Constantinopolitan diptychs of the dead. Its chief importance is in confirming that the diaconal phrase Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος... was not only part of the diptychs of the living, as we shall see abundantly below in the next chapter, but also of the dead.

VI. Where Were the Diptychs of the Dead Proclaimed?

Where was the deacon standing for the proclamation of the diptychs of the dead? Leo Tuscan's rubrics cited above in section B.II.1 say they were proclaimed from the sanctuary (chorus), behind the altar, by the deacon who had chanted the ektene: *Hic autem qui stat in choro post sanctum altare diaconus, qui fecerat continuatam orationem.* And all evidence available from the rubrics in the euchology and diataxis mss point to the fact that the deacon indeed proclaimed the lists from within the sanctuary, while incensing around the altar. Though far too late to serve as evidence of the pristine usage, one miniature in a seventeenth-century Russian ms confirms this. The scene is obviously during the eucharistic anaphora, for the uncovered gifts are depicted on the altar, before which stands the priest and deacon. The latter has the thurible in his right hand, and, in his left, a sheet with the inscription: "*Pomjani, Gospodi, duši* – Remember, Lord, the souls..."[95]

serant III (ST 233, Vatican 1964) 209-222; M. Foskolos, "Τὰ παλαιὰ ἑλληνικὰ βιβλία τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Κολλεγίου τοῦ Ἁγίου Ἀθανασίου τῆς Ῥώμης, *Ὁ Ἐρανίστης* 9 (1971) 1-62; T.E. Sklabenitis, "Προσθήκης ἑλληνικῇ βιβλιογραφίᾳ," *θησαυρίσματα* 14 (1977) 127-156. Furthermore, no euchology in the Vatican Library collection is dated 1663 (I am grateful to my colleague Ugo Zanetti, S.J., for checking the catalogue, thereby saving me one more trip to the library). The 1727 edition has been unavailable to me. But whatever the origins of the usage given here, the identification of the same text in one or two further 17-18th c. printed sources would not change my conclusions.

[95] I. Nowikowa, *Eine anonyme russische Handschrift des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen 1968) Tafel II facing p. 12. The Russian text refers to the document in the deacon's hand as the *sinodik* (text facing Blatt 4). According to the editor this is the earliest witness to the use of that term in Russian for the diptychs of the dead (*ibid.* 31).

VII. Excursus: The Theotokos Heirmos Ἄξιόν ἐστιν

Since the sixteenth century – and not earlier, apparently – the Ἐξαιρέτως ekphonesis has been followed in CHR by the troparion Ἄξιόν ἐστιν, heirmos of the *Magnificat* canticle (Lk 1:46-55), the ninth ode of Byzantine orthros (matins), or by its proper replacement on the Great Feasts.[96] As Winkler has abundantly demonstrated,[97] a Theotokion begins to appear first in but a few tenth-century euchologies – CHR of *Grottaferrata Gb IV* (f. 23r), BAS of *Sevastianov 474*[98] – *before the Marian ekphonesis*, then later, and ever more frequently, after the ekphonesis, at first to be recited silently by the deacon and/or presider and concelebrating clergy, until it finally develops into a full-fledged chant.[99] One finds a variety of Theotokia, initially and most frequently *Ave Maria* (Χαίρε κεχαριτωμένη), often in combination with others,[100] before they are replaced, beginning ca. 1380 with the archieratikon of Gemistos,[101] by today's Ἄξιόν ἐστιν and its festive propers.

The interpolation into the anaphora of a Marian refrain seems to have originated in the non-Byzantine liturgies of the Greek East (JAS, MK[102]) and, like so many other oriental liturgical peculiarities, entered Byzantine usage via the Siculo-Calabrian usage of Magna Graecia – but not the usage of Otranto, which, as usual, remained true to the purer Constantinopolitan rite longer.[103]

Why the refrain eventually came to be sung by the congregation, not just recited, as initially, by the clergy, seems clear enough. By the eleventh century, as we have seen, the proclamation aloud of the diaconal lists had fallen into disuse, leaving a vacuum between the two presider's ekphoneseis (Ἐξαιρέτως/Εν πρώτοις). Since liturgy, like nature, abhors a vacuum,

[96] WINKLER, "Interzessionen" I, 323. BAS has in its place the Theotokion in tone 8 of the second stichology of orthros (Ἐπὶ σοὶ χαίρει) or the festive heirmos of the ninth ode.

[97] *Ibid.* I, 323-6, II, 351-4.

[98] KS 264.

[99] Mss listed in WINKLER, "Interzessionen" I, 326-7. To W's list add these mss with *Ave Maria* after the ekphonesis: the 12-13th c. roll *Vallicelliana Gr. 112 (G 70)*; and before the ekphonesis: 15th c. *Istanbul Patriarchal Library Panaghia Kamariotissa 87 (90)* AD 1475) f. 18v, and *141 (144)* f. 23v.

[100] *Ibid.* I, 324-30.

[101] DMITR II, 313; cf. WINKLER, "Interzessionen" I, 325-6.

[102] PO 26.2:212.20-21; CUMING 29.13-15 = PE 106, 256.

[103] WINKLER, "Interzessionen" I, 327, 334-6.

the Theotokion, already recited privately by the ministers and so ready to hand, rushed in to fill the gap. As Winkler notes, though one might be tempted to reverse the sequence, seeing the interpolation as responsible for the displacement or obsolesence of the diptychs, that will not fit the chronology: the evidence shows that the diptychs had fallen into disuse before the refrain came to be sung aloud.[104]

CONCLUSION

The historical and liturgical sources for the Constantinopolitan diptychs of the dead have permitted us to highlight their structure as it emerges by the fifth century:

1. The opening Marian ekphonesis by the presiding celebrant.
2. The diptychs proclaimed aloud by the deacon:

[a] Opening with the exhortation: "For those who have fallen asleep in Christ, and for those who have remembrances made for them (Ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ κεκοιμημένων καὶ τῶν τὰς μνείας ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐπιτελουμένων)."

[b] Then recalling by name the dead patriarchs of the pentarchy, the bishops of the local see, then, by category, the fathers of the ecumenical councils, the lower clergy, the sovereigns again by name, and all the deceased Orthodox Christians beloved of Christ.

[c] And concluding with the customary diaconal formula, complete or only its finale: "And for those whom each one has in mind, and for each and all (⟨Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος κατὰ διάνοιαν ἔχει⟩ καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν)."

3. The entire unit being concluded by the response of the people: "And for each and all (Καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν)."

We shall see the exact same structure repeated in the diptychs of the living, showing that the great concern of the Byzantines for τάξις, order,[105] was reflected also in the careful structural balance of their liturgical rites.

[104] *Ibid.* I, 333.

[105] A. KAZHDAN, G. CONSTABLE, *People and Power in Byzantium. An Introduction to Modern Byzantine Studies* (Washington DC 1982) 60-66, 126, 134, 137, 158, 161.

Of course this structure can date only from the fifth century, when the commemoration of Mary Theotokos was introduced into the liturgy of Constantinople by Patriarch Gennadius I (358-471).[106]

Since there are no extant Greek texts of the Constantinopolitan diptychs of the dead, nothing more can be said about their text, for we really know for certain only how they began (Ἐξαιρέτως...) and ended (Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος... καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν); all the rest is hypothetical. As to just who were named in the diptychs of the dead – how many dead patriarchs, bishops, sovereigns – and whether the Byzantine diptychs had always been proclaimed during the anaphora, and in their present sequence, with those of the dead preceding those of the living, contrary to the order found in other traditions, I shall return in the last chapter to these disputed issues.

[106] See note 17 above.

CHAPTER V

THE BYZANTINE DIPTYCHS OF THE LIVING: HISTORY AND LITURGY

A. THE HISTORICAL SOURCES

I. The Hierarchy 1: Interecclesial Commemorations between Patriarchates

If the Church of Constantinople's concern for the dead led it to give precedence to their diptychs over those of the living, that does not mean that those still in this vale of tears were forgotten. We have seen Atticus speak of two lists in Constantinople, one for the dead, another for the living,[1] a practice substantiated by earlier and later sources from Constantinople and elsewhere in the East. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Hom. 15*, 14, is clear on the topic,[2] as is Maximus' *Relatio motionis*, Acta I, 5.[3] And his *Scholia* on Ps.-Dionysius, *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* III, 3:9,[4] notes explicitly that Ps.-Dionysius speaks only of the diptychs of the dead, "and not, as now, of the living too."[5]

1. *The Early Monophysite Controversy*

These diptychs of the living, equally if not more important in interecclesial politics than those of the departed, also have a long history. In 451 Pope Leo I, the Great, responded negatively – "Ne-

[1] Previous chapter, section A.I.3.
[2] ST 145:527-8.
[3] PG 90:117D, cited in chapter IV at note 32.
[4] PG 3:437B.
[5] PG 4:145A. See chapter VI at note 49.

que...nomen ad altare recitetur"[6] – to Patriarch Anatolius' (449-458) inquiry of November 22, 450,[7] about including in the diptychs – "De nominibus...ad sacram altare recitandis"[8] – the names of the still living Dioscorus I († 454), pope of Alexandria from 444 until Chalcedon deposed him October 13, 451, Juvenal of Jerusalem (422-458), and Eustathius of Berytus (Beirut) (*ante* 448-451), ringleaders of the "Robber Council" of Ephesus in 449.

2. *The Acacian Schism (484-519)*

Furthermore, it is clear that the names "recited at the altar" were read *aloud*. During the troubles over the *Henotikon* of Zeno (482), Evagrius Scholasticus (ca. 536-600), *Church History* III, 20,[9] recounts how the *akoimetoi* or "sleepless" monks of Constantinople[10] denounced to Pope Felix III (483-492) that at Constantinople under Patriarch Acacius (472-489) the name of Peter III Mongus (ὁ μογγός, "the stammerer"), Monophysite pope of Alexandria (477, 482-490), had been commemo-

[6] *Ep. 85*, 2, PL 54:924.

[7] The text is lost. References to the inquiry are listed in Reg 118.

[8] *Ep. 80*, 3, PL 54:914-5.

[9] BIDEZ-PARMENTIER 118 = PG 86.2:2637. On Evagrius' history, see P. ALLEN, *Evagrius Scholasticus the Church Historian* (Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense, Études et documents 41, Louvain 1981).

[10] On these monks, called "sleepless" because they celebrated, in shifts, an uninterrupted Divine Office (ἀδιάλειπτῶς λατρεία), see E. DE STOOP (ed.), *Vie d'Alexandre l'acémète, texte grec et traduction latine*, PO 6.5; V. GRUMEL, "Acémètes," *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* 1:169-75; E. MARIN, "Acémètes," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* 1:304-8; J. PARGOIRE, "Un mot sur les acémètes," EO 2 (1898-1899) 304-8, 365-72; ID., "Acémètes," DACL 1:307-21; S. VAILHÉ, "Acémètes," *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques* 1:274-82; J. M. FOUNTOULIS, *Ἡ εἰκοσιτετράωρος ἀκοίμητος δοξολογία* (Athens 1963); M. GEDEON, "Ἀναγνώσεις ἐκ τοῦ Ὡρολογίου τῆς τῶν Ἀκοιμήτων Μόνης," *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια* 23 (1903) 380-2, 390-4, 401-2, 447-8, 455-6, 462-3, 532-4; 24 (1904) 211-3; 25 (1905) 215-6, 234-5. The *akoimetoi* flourished in the 5-6th c., especially under Hegumen Marcellus (SYMEON METAPHRASTES, *Vita S. Marcelli archimandritae*, PG 116:705-46), but were not influential after iconoclasm, when the Studite reform became predominant in Constantinopolitan monasticism (on the liturgical aspects of this shift, see TAFT, "Mt. Athos"). We still hear of the *akoimetoi* as late as 1200, however, from the Russian pilgrim Anthony of Novgorod: X. M. LOPAREV (ed.), *Kniga palomčik. Skazanie mest svjatyx vo Caregrade Antonija Arxiepiskopa Novgorodskago v 1200 godu* (PPSb tom XVII, vypusk 3, St. Petersburg 1899) 18, 32, 67, 80, 90; cf. Mme. DE KHITROWO, *Itinéraires russes en Orient*, I.1 (Geneva 1889) 97, 107.

rated in the sacred diptychs (ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς δέλτοις), at first secretly (ἀνεγινώσκετο), later openly (ἀναφανδόν),[11] a distinction that would make no sense unless the names were customarily read audibly so everyone could hear them. If they were meant to be read quietly (μυστικῶς), then anyone at all could be named and no one would be the wiser.

In a Roman synod of 484 Pope Felix deposed his legates, bishops Vitalis and Misenus, who had been bribed to send a report favorable to Peter Mongus, annulled what they had done, excommunicated Mongus and Acacius, and pronounced the latter deposed too.[12] On October 485, Felix renewed these excommunications and, for good measure, pronounced Peter Fuller of Antioch deposed. Acacius retaliated by striking the pope's name from the diptychs of the Great Church,[13] thus initiating the thirty-five year long Acacian Schism (484-519), which lasted until the accession of Emperor Justin I in 518, when renewed contacts led to peace with Rome.[14]

The duration of this first serious break between Rome and Constantinople was due to Rome's obstinate refusal of communion as long as the names of Peter Mongus († 490) and Acacius († 489), living or dead, continued to be named in the diptychs. As Fortescue remarks, the issue highlights the nature of the Constantinopolitan diptychs as distinct from other intercessions – and, Dix would add, as distinct from the western *nomina*.

> It is important to understand why Rome made such a point of the erasure of the names from diptychs in the East. Certainly we may pray for anyone, dead or living. There was no idea of preventing private prayers for dead heretics... But the public reading of names in diptychs is another matter. The Church allows this honour only to her own members. To read the name of a living bishop in the diptychs was always a recognized sign of communion with him. In the same way, to read the name of a dead man in

[11] Evagrius Scholasticus, HE III, 20, Bidez-Parmentier 117.

[12] Cf. *ibid.* III, 19, Bidez-Parmentier 117. Felix had instructed his legates to stand with the *akoimetoi* and their abbot Cyril. On the whole question, see Felix II, *Ep. 1-4*, A. Theil, *Epistulae Romanorum pontificum genuinae et quae ad eos scriptae sunt a S. Hilaro usque ad Pelagium II* (Braunsberg 1868) I, 222-41; Fortescue 5.

[13] Evagrius Scholasticus, HE III, 21, Bidez-Parmentier 118-20; Liberatus Diaconus, *Breviarium* 17-18, PL 68:1026-30; cf. Fortescue 6.

[14] For the diptychs of Constantinople during this period, see Reg 175, 178, 179.

> the diptychs of the faithful departed was a sign that he was considered to have died in the communion of the Church; particularly in the case of notorious people like Mongus and Acacius it would mean approbation of what they had done and refusal to acknowledge their excommunication.[15]

Though many monks of Constantinople, including the *akoimetoi*, continued in communion with Rome during the schism, the issue was not resolved until the signing, in 519, of the "Reunion Formula of Hormisdas," after the death of Patriarch Timothy I of Constantinople (511-518), who, in a final Monophysite manoeuver, had included John Niciotas, Monophysite pope of Alexandria (505-516), in the diptychs (ἐν τοῖς διπτύχοις ἔταξεν) of the Great Church.[16] The "Formula" or *Regula fidei* which Pope Hormisdas (514-523) sent to Emperor Anastasius I in 515, insisting that all bishops sign it, which they did in 519, had the signers promise, *inter alia*, that the excommunicates' "names would not be recited in the sacred mysteries (eorum nomina inter sacra non esse recitanda mysteria)."[17]

3. *The Three Chapters and Constantinople II*

The Byzantine diptychs long continued to be an issue of politico-symbolic import in East-West ecclesial relations.[18] In the uproar over the "Three Chapters" of 544 and the consequent struggle between Justinian and Pope Vigilius (537-555), the fathers of the Council of Constantinople II in 553 removed Vigilius' name from the diptychs of the Great Church, all the while protesting their communion with the see of Rome, a rather nice distinction which Vigilius, in Byzantine exile, hardly appreciated but was constrained to accept.[19]

4. *Later Sources: Relations with Rome*

Then, in the tenth century, the diptychs of the Great Church regain center stage in the East, when the influence of the Byzantine Church

[15] FORTESCUE 6-7.

[16] THEODORE LECTOR, HE, *Epitome* no. 495, GCS 52:140.18-20.

[17] Text in FORTESCUE 15-8. On the Formula, see W. HAACKE, *Die Glaubensformel des Papstes Hormisdas im Acacianischen Schisma* (Analecta Gregoriana 20, Rome 1939).

[18] See MICHEL I, 40-2.

[19] ACO IV.1, 202. Cf. EVERY 51.

was at its zenith. The Arabic chroniclers Sa'īd ibn Baṭrīq (alias Eutychius, Melkite patriarch of Alexandria, 933-940) and Sa'īd ibn Yaḥya of Antioch, report in their *Annals* the inclusion of Patriarch Theophylact of Constantinople (933-956) in the diptychs of Alexandria and Antioch in 937/38, upon his sending of the synodical letters, the first such inclusion since the Ummayyad Caliphate (661-750).[20] Ibn Yaḥya adds that no pope of Rome was named between 685-999/1000 – he says they continued to name Pope Benedict II (684-685) all those years – for want of information,[21] though in 920 Patriarch Nicholas I Mysticus (912-925) had offered diptychal commemoration to Pope John X (914-928).[22]

And indeed, in an age of confusion and political disruption and change, not all Roman popes found their way into the Byzantine diptychs. Between 972 and 1009 only Boniface VII (974, 984-985), John XV (985-996), John XVI (997-998), and John XVIII (1004-1009) did, the others not.[23] But this was not because the principle of communion and diptychal inclusion was no longer of interest in Byzantium. More often than not the Byzantines did not know who the real pope was, either because they had not been notified, or, more likely, because in this less-than-brilliant epoch of rapidly succeeding, brief Roman pontificates, rival contenders to the papal throne made the Byzantines cautious about recognizing popes who might not succeed in ultimately establishing their claims to the see.[24]

The Byzantine diptychs remain in the news throughout the eleventh century, at the time of the Filioque crisis (1009-1019),[25] in 1053-

[20] L. CHEIKHO (ed.), *Eutychii patriarchae Alexandrini annales, pars prior* (CSCO 50, script. Arabi, textus, ser. 3, tom. 6, Beirut-Paris 1946) 87-8; Latin version in PG 111:1156; ID., B. CARRA DE VAUX, H. ZAYYAT (eds.), *ibid., pars posterior, accedunt Annales Yahia Ibn Saïd Antiochenis* (CSCO 51, script. Arabi, textus, ser. 3, tom. 7, Beirut-Paris 1949) 93; also I. KRATCHKOVSKY, A. VASILIEV (eds.), *Histoire de Yahya-ibn-Sa'īd d'Antioche, continuateur de Sa'īd-ibn-Bitriq*, fasc. 1, PO 18.5:710-11 = Reg. 787. On Eutychius' work, see M. BREYDY, *Études sur Sa'īd ibn Baṭrīq et ses sources* (CSCO 450, Subsidia, tom. 69, Louvain 1983). Cf. EVERY 138-9.

[21] PO 18.5:706-8; ed. CHEIKHO (see previous note) 92 = Reg 787. Cf. EVERY 138 note 6.

[22] Reg 675, 696.

[23] EVERY 142-3, cf. 180-1.

[24] EVERY 149-50, 180.

[25] Reg 819; MICHEL II, 22ff.

1054 during the troubles between Rome and Patriarch Michael I Cerularius (1043-1058),[26] when Pope Alexander III (1159-1181) sent a mission to Constantinople in 1168 or 1169,[27] again under Emperor Alexis I Comnenus (1081-1118) at the Synod of Constantinople in 1089,[28] and in 1211 during the Latin occupation of Constantinople (1204-1261).[29]

5. *Denouement: The Union of Florence (1439)*

And so it went, right up until the end of Byzantium.[30] The final act in the diptychal drama played out for so long between Rome and Constanti-

[26] Reg 864, 866, 879; HUSSEY 135; EVERY 177-8, 180-3, 187-8, 192. From the correspondence of Pope Leo IX (1049-1054) to Michael Cerularius (PL 143:773-5) and of Michael to Patriarch Peter III of Antioch (PG 120:784), we know that Michael wrote to Leo IX in 1053, offering to restore his name to the diptychs of Constantinople if Michael's own name were commemorated at Rome. Cf. M. JUGIE, "Le schisme de Michel Cérulaire," EO 36 (1937) 441, 448. MICHEL II, 178-84, showed that the pope's name was removed from the diptychs ca. 1009. But in 1054, Peter of Antioch justified including the pope in his diptychs by the example of John of Antioch (997-1022) and Sergius II of Constantinople (1001-1019), who still commemorated Pope John XVIII in their diptychs in 1009. Peter added that he does not know how the pope's name came to be dropped (PG 120:799-800; cf. 787-90; PL 143:951-2).

[27] EVERY 168.

[28] EVERY 156-8, 180, 192; HUSSEY 168-9 = Reg 953, 954. After Pope Urban II (1088-1099) lifted the excommunication against him in 1089, Alexis, who had forbidden the celebration of the eucharist with azymes, reopened the Latin churches in the capital and advised the synod to restore, at least provisionally, the pope's name to the diptychs, since there had been no synodal judgement to justify not doing so. To an imperial inquiry the synod had replied: "Not by a synodical judgement and examination was the Roman Church erased from communion with ours, but, as it seems, through our want of watchful care (ἀσυντηρήτως), the pope's name was not commemorated in the holy diptychs." Cited from codex *British Library Add. 34060*, f. 570, by HOLTZMANN 60-2; trans. from EVERY 180, cf. 156-8. On this affair see also S. RUNCIMAN, *The Eastern Schism. A Study of the Papacy and the Eastern Churches during the XIth and XIIth Centuries* (Oxford 1955) 60ff, 159.

[29] PG 140:292-8; EVERY 173-4, 186-7.

[30] See HUSSEY 210, 217, 242, 246, 281-2, 293; Reg 1244, 1248, 1489.

nople was the Council of Florence.[31] Arranz sums up the state of things succinctly:

> The mention of the pope in the diptychs of the Greeks, impossible before the union, was a source of conflict even after it: it will become, in fact, a question of life or death for [Greek] unionists and anti-unionists alike.[32]

Even after signing the Bull of Union, the Greek bishops, still in Florence, refused to commemorate Pope Eugene IV (1431-1447) in the diptychs despite the insistence of John VIII Palcologus (1425-1448), penultimate Byzantine Emperor and a decisive supporter of the union which the Greek ecclesiastics had, let us remember, just signed. But this was neither obstinacy nor inconsistency. The chief hierarch of the Greeks, Patriarch Joseph II (1416-1439), had died suddenly in Florence on June 10, 1439, and was buried the following day in Santa Maria Novella, where he still lies.[33] Now although modern Orthodox ecclesiologists like to play down the authority of the ecumenical patriarch the way many of their Catholic counterparts are trying, desperately, to do with the authority of the papacy (if for different reasons), what has become an almost ritual insistence that the patriarch of Constantinople is not an Orthodox pope should not blind one to another strain in Orthodox tradition. For one can also find Medieval Orthodox writers who were ready to attribute to the ecumenical throne far greater authority than their modern brethren will countenance – all of which is just one more manifestation of the plurality in Orthodox theological thinking long obvious to anyone who reads sources instead of just repeating clichés. Now according to Sylvester Syropoulos, Great Ecclesiarch of the Great Church,[34] without a patriarch the

[31] For several of the following references concerning the diptychs at Florence, I am indebted to M. ARRANZ, "Circonstances et conséquences liturgiques du Concile Ferrara-Florence" (in press), a paper delivered at the International Colloquium *Il concilio di Ferrara-Firenze a cinque secoli e mezzo di distanza*, held September 23-29, 1989, in the two conciliar cities, chiefly in Florence: cf. ID., "Il concilio di Ferrara-Firenze a cinque secoli e mezzo di distanza," OCP 56 (1990) 193-196. I am grateful to my colleague for providing me with the typescript of "Circonstances" before it went to press.

[32] "Circonstances."

[33] LAURENT, CFDS IX, 473.

[34] On the office of Great Ecclesiarch, see DARROUZÈS 285-8. Not everyone considers Syropoulos an impartial witness to what took place at the Council of Florence, which is not surprising, for Syropoulos was decidedly anti-Catholic. But for our purposes that is beside the point. He is certainly a reliable witness to Orthodox liturgical practice, which is the focus of our attention here.

Orthodox at Florence felt themselves to a certain extent acephalous. Furthermore, they were determined to remain in that canonical limbo until they could get home and elect a successor freely, on their own turf, without outside pressure or interference.

This attitude emerges clearly from the arguments the Greeks advance for refusing to proceed immediately to the election of the dead patriarch's successor, as the pope wished,[35] as well as from the problems provoked by an Orthodox Dormition liturgy that same momentous year. On his own initiative, apparently, the Greek bishop who ultimately would be elected patriarch in Constantinople on May 4/5 the following year, pro-unionist Metropolitan Metrophanes of Cyzicus (Balzik-kale) in the Hellespont,[36] celebrated on August 15, in a Latin convent, a liturgy at which he commemorated the pope, whereupon his brethren remonstrated that with their patriarch dead, no one could authorize this.[37]

The pope does not seem to have made much of all this: Syropoulos himself tells us the pope did not attach much importance to the diptychal commemorations.[38] The diptychs did not have the same importance in Latin liturgical practice, as we have already noted above in chapter II. What the Latins were interested in was communion, not its diptychal trappings, doubtless because of the different diptychal orientation in the West, which focussed on the local church communion, not on interecclesial relations, as in the Byzantine tradition.

The emperor, however, a Byzantine fully cognizant of the significance of the Orthodox diptychal anaphora, was adamant. He ordered the pope commemorated at the Greek liturgy he had celebrated in the palace where he was residing on July 12, 1439, the first Sunday after the union, in the presence of a Latin delegation.[39] And in the solemn liturgy celebrated in St. Mark's, Venice, on Sunday, September 20 or 27,[40] before embarking for the voyage home, the emperor had the opponents of the union chosen as concelebrants deliberately, to force their hand and make them compromise themselves publicly by celebrating in a Latin church and commemorating the pope in the diptychs. Some try to beg off on various pretexts (they are ill, they have no vestments), but, forced to concelebrate, they still refuse

[35] SYROPOULOS X, 18 and 24 = LAURENT, CFDS IX, 504, 510.
[36] FEDALTO I, 140.
[37] SYROPOULOS XI, 3 = LAURENT CFDS IX, 524.
[38] SYROPOULOS X, 19-20 = LAURENT, CFDS IX, 504.
[39] SYROPOULOS X, 19 = LAURENT, CFDS IX, 505.
[40] LAURENT, CFDS IX, 527 note 5.

to commemorate the pope, taking courage from the fact that the emperor was not present at the service.[41]

The dispute continued on home ground, in the post-union debates over the diptychs in Constantinople. The pro-unionists argue that the diptychal commemoration is not even a prayer. "They do not pray for him [the pope], since the deacon says only this: *Eugenius the most blessed pope*, and he [the deacon] in no way prays for nor does he solicit prayer from others for the pope."[42] This sophistry is rightly rejected.

> The commemoration in the diptychs is the most important of all. For the others solicit prayer from those listening and those outside the sanctuary. The diptychs, however, do not solicit prayer from those outside, but first the patriarch says: *Remember, Lord, the whole episcopate of the Orthodox rightly handling the word of your truth*, so that the patriarch prays first for those "rightly handling." Then straightaway the deacon, speaking next, proclaims in a loud voice just who these "right handlers" are.

The pope is certainly not one of them because of the *Filioque*, Syropoulos adds, and should not be commemorated in the diptychs "with the eastern patriarchs." The Mesazon Notaras,[43] exasperated by all this, ends by observing, "Happy we would be if, foreseeing this, we had completely abolished the diptychs from the liturgy before you got ready to leave Italy!"

Nevertheless, at the Pentecost liturgy in Hagia Sophia, May 15, 1440, celebrated by the newly elected (May 4/5, 1440) Patriarch Metrophanes II (1440-1443) and ten unionist metropolitans, assisted by numerous lesser clergy and monks and a large crowd of faithful, Pope Eugenius IV was named in the diptychs.[44] A month later in a letter of June 10 to the people of Methone, a suffragan diocese of Patras in the Province of Helladis, Greece,[45] the patriarch announced the same and ordered that his example be followed.[46] At least some Greek patriarchs

[41] SYROPOULOS XI, 5-9 = LAURENT IX, 526-30.

[42] SYROPOULOS XII, 13 = LAURENT, CFDS IX, 564: "λόγον οὐδὲ γὰρ εὔχονται ὑπὲρ ἐκείνου, λόγον δὲ μόνον ὁ διάκονος, τό: Εὐγενίου τοῦ μακαριωτάτου πάπα, καὶ οὔτε ἐκεῖνος εὔχεται οὔτε ἀπταιτεῖ παρ' ἄλλων εὐχὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ πάπα."

[43] The μεσάζων, i.e. chartophylax or archivist, was the major official of the patriarchal chancellary. Cf. DARROUZÈS 19-28, 53-9, 201-2, 334-53, 508-25.

[44] GILL 351.

[45] FEDALTO II, 510.

[46] HOFMANN, CFDS III.3, doc. 36, p. 47.

and bishops acceded to Metrophanes' exhortation, as the extant documentation proves.[47]

But the end was nigh. Isidore of Kiev,[48] sent as papal legate to Constantinople, promulgated the union there on December 12, 1452, five months before the fall of the city. Isidore fought in the seige then escaped to Rome where he died, faithful to the union, on May 27, 1464.[49] As Gill somberly concludes his history, "The union was at an end."[50] So were the diptychs of the living in the rite of the Great Church: their role as a major issue in the relations between Constantinople and other sees did not survive the fall of Constantinople on May 29, 1453.

* * *

I have no wish to review here the whole history of medieval Byzantine inter-church politics. But even this superficial dip into that history makes it abundantly clear that during all this period the diptychs of the living were still actively used in the liturgy of the Great Church, and that the list included at least the names of the other patriarchs. So the Byzantine diptychs of the living were not a local honor roll, like the East-Syrian diptychs,[51] but an expression of inter-ecclesial communion in the pentarchy.

II. The Hierarchy 2: Intereparchial Commemorations within Patriarchates

Of course this does not mean that the courtesies demanded by ecclesial communion not just *between* but also *within* local administrative conscriptions (patriarchates, metropolitanates, eparchies) were ignored. If for

[47] *Ibid.* doc. 38, pp. 51-3.

[48] A Greek born in Monembasia in the Province of Helladis ca. 1385, Isidore was ordained Metropolitan of Kiev and all Russia in 1436.

[49] GILL 383-8.

[50] *Ibid.* 388.

[51] See chapter III, section C.I.2.

obvious reasons – they were of much less import for the politics of empire and Church – there is little extant evidence for the diptychs on the level of the local eparchies, it is equally obvious that the local bishop was commemorated, then as now, in the diptychs of his Church.

1. *Within the Patriarchate of Antioch*

In 443-444, when Athanasius, bishop of Perrhe in Euphratensis just north of Samosata, a suffragan see of Hierapolis (Mabbug) within the patriarchate of Antioch,[52] was deposed and chased out by his clergy, and his name erased from the diptychs (τῶν ἱερῶν δέλτων περιελεῖν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἐπισκοπεύοντος), Patriarch Proclus of Constantinople (434-446) intervened on his behalf in a synodical letter to Patriarch Domnus of Antioch (441/2-450).[53]

2. *Within the Patriarchate of Constantinople*

And during the Palamite controversy, within the Patriarchate of Constantinople a February 2, 1347 decree of Patriarch John IV Kalekas (1334-1347) excommunicated and anathematized hesychast abbot Gregory Palamas (ca. 1296-1359), shortly thereafter (May 1347) ordained metropolitan of Thessalonika (1347-1359), for refusing him the anaphora.[54]

The intrapatriarchal demands of the diptychal anaphora were even extended to the "lesser" – i.e., non-pentarchial – patriarchates. Continued Bulgarian refusal to accede to the niceties of the anaphora remained a problem. In a response to the monks of Tirnovo ca. 1361/2,[55] Patriarch Callistus I (1350-1353, 1355-1363) reminds the Bulgarians that their patriarch of Tirnovo "must always commemorate our most humble self and the other [three Orthodox pentarchial] patriarchs in the sacred diptychs."[56]

[52] See HINDO, *Appendice* II, 469-70.

[53] Reg 87. The text is conserved in the Acts of Chalcedon, ACO II.1:3, 426-7 = PROCLUS, *Ep. 13*, PG 65:881-4.

[54] Reg 2265.

[55] Reg 2442, cf. 2384.

[56] MM I, 438.15-17: ἀνάγκην ἔχειν ἀναφέρειν ἀεὶ τήν τε ἡμῶν μετριότητα καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους πατριάρχας ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς διπτύχοις.

Tirnovo was a second-rank patriarchate, not on the same level as the incumbants of the pentarchial sees. Hence he should commemorate in the diptychs the patriarch of Constantinople *just like the metropolitans of the Ecumenical Throne* – presumably because he ought to consider himself on that level, like any other suffragan within the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

For good measure, Callistus cites a tomos (ca. 1235-1240) of Patriarch Germanus II (1223-1240) to the same effect.[57] Indeed, Germanus provides a nice tidbit of Second-Rome universalism of the sort that some naifs fancy to be characteristic only of the First Rome. He declares roundly that since the other three Orthodox patriarchs of the pentarchy are under the direct control of the ecumenical patriarch, all the more does the patriarch of the Bulgars remain submitted to the Church of Constantinople, from which he received his title and privileges, with the attendant obligation to give its patriarch the anaphora.[58]

The point I wish to make is, I think, clear: within the patriarchate, all the metropolitans had to commemorate "first of all" their superior, the patriarch.

III. The Hierarchy 3: Local Eparchial Diptychs

But ecclesiological and canonical principles are one thing, seeing to their observance another. As late as Patriarch Athanasius I (1289-1293, 1303-1309) we find his beatitude complaining to Emperor Andronicus II Paleologus (1282-1328), in *Letter 69*, of commemoration problems in the diptychs. Contrary to the canons, absentee bishops

[57] MM I, 438.26-439.19 = Reg 1285.

[58] Reg 1285. For a similar universalist ecclesiology on the part of Patriarch Philotheus Kokkinos (1353-54, 1364-76), whose first patriarchate came between Callistus' two sessions on the throne, see J. MEYENDORFF, *Byzantium and the Rise of Russia. A Study of Byzantino-Russian Relations in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge 1981) 283-4; cf. *ibid.* chapter 8 on Philotheus.

resident in the capital (a perennial problem[59]) were neglecting to name the local ordinary (in this case, Athanasius himself) in the liturgy, and the metropolitan of Sardis even went so far as to prevent another celebrant from doing so.

> For I consider it extremely unjust that in every other city subject to Roman rule the bishop of another city does not have the right...to omit to mention ⟨in the diptychs⟩ the name of the bishop of that city, but here in the capital this is a frequent occurrence...[60] What about the metropolitan of Sardis? Didn't he prevent the celebrant of the liturgy from mentioning ⟨my⟩ name as is customarily done by others?[61]

Athanasius' complaint is not based on the fact that he is the patriarch of these bishops, but that they are neglecting to mention him *in his own eparchy*. So even a bishop had to mention the local hierarch within whose jurisdiction he happened to be presiding at a liturgy – even, presumably, one who outranked him.

Such problems existed also on the diocesan level, not only among bishops, but also between the bishop and his clergy. In AD 1368, Bishop David of Hierissos and the Holy Mountain, a suffragan see of Thessaloniki in the Province of Macedonia,[62] complained that the protos Sava of Mt. Athos, a Serb, did not have him commemorated at the liturgy "first," as was his right, since the Holy Mountain fell within his see. The Permanent Synod of Constantinople ordered Sava to do so.[63] And a decree of September 1395 was addressed to the protopapas and clergy of Euripos who refused to commemorate their bishop, the metropolitan of Athens.[64]

So at each level of the hierarchical ladder, presiders at the liturgy were obliged to name their immediate episcopal superior, and refusal to do so was at their own peril. But by this time we already have extant liturgical diptychs to confirm such details, as we shall see in a moment.

[59] See Reg 24, 835, and legislation against the abuse in JUSTINIAN, *Novella* III, 2, R. SCHOELL, G. KROLL (eds.), *Corpus Iuris Civilis* III (Berlin 1899) 21-3.

[60] TALBOT 168:86-7, 169.

[61] TALBOT 173:158-9, 174.

[62] FEDALTO I, 441-3.

[63] Reg 2539.

[64] Reg 3013.

IV. Commemoration of the Sovereigns

But if most such diptychal disputes concerned issues of orthodoxy, communion, or rivalries among bishops, even the imperial naming could give rise to problems, as we learn from the *Vita* 17 of Patriarch Euthymius I of Constantinople (907-912). The imperial consort Zoe Carbounopsina, fourth wife of Emperor Leo VI (886-912), demanded that the patriarch have her proclaimed in the churches (ἀναγορεύεσθαι ἐπ' ἐκκλησίας[65]), as the senate had done, or else. Because of the tetragamy, Euthymius refused with this courageous riposte:

> Be this known, that never, during my brief days while I am in the [service of the] Church, your name will neither be acclaimed nor placed in the sacred diptychs (τὸ σὸν ὄνομα οὔτ' ἐκφωνηθήσεται οὔτ' ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς διπτύχοις τεθήσεται).[66]

This was the beginning, not the end of Euthymius' troubles with diptychs. On the death in 912 of Leo VI, who had replaced Patriarch Nicholas I Mysticus (901-907, 912-925) with his confessor Euthymius over the marriage issue, Nicholas retook his patriarchal throne, and Euthymius was mistreated, deposed, and removed from the diptychs, though after his death Patriarch Polyeuctus (956-970) restored his name to the lists.[67]

B. THE LITURGICAL SOURCES

1. The Opening Ekphonesis of the Presider

As I noted above in chapter I, section C.II, as well as in the conclusion to the previous chapter, the structure of the diptychs of the living is

[65] This text probably refers to the acclamations, discussed above at the beginning of chapter I, section A no. 3. On the use of ἀναγορεύομαι in that context, see PS.-CODINUS, *De officiis*, ed. VERPEAUX 133.22, 156.3, 157.22-3.

[66] KARLIN-HAYTER 109-13, citation 112-3. The *Vita* dates from ca. 920-25 (*ibid.* 10). On Leo VI and the issues involved in his marital problems, see Reg 625-9; N. OIKONOMIDES, "Leo VI and the Narthex Mosaic of Saint Sophia," DOP 30 (1976) 161-70; ID., "Leo VI's Legislation of 907 Forbidding Fourth Marriages. An Interpolation in the *Prochieros Nomos* (IV, 25-27)," DOP 30 (1976) 173-93; HUSSEY 102-8.

[67] HUSSEY 105-6.

exactly the same as that of the diptychs of the dead: an exclamation of the presider introduces them, then the deacon proclaims the lists.

1. *The Textus Receptus*

Throughout the entire ms tradition, the diptychs of the living open with this ekphonesis:

> Ἐν πρώτοις μνήσθητι Κύριε τοῦ (ἀρχι)ἐπισκόπου ἡμῶν **τοῦ δεῖνος** ὃν χάρισαι ταῖς ἁγίαις σου ἐκκλησίαις ἐν εἰρήνῃ σῶον ἔντιμον ὑγιὰ μακροημερεύοντα καὶ ὀρθοτομοῦντα τὸν λόγον τῆς σῆς ἀληθείας.[68]

The concluding phrase from 2 Tim 2:15, "rightly handling the word of [your] truth," is apparently liturgical *Formelgut*, part of that common stock of standard early Greek liturgical phraseology one finds across the traditions from ancient times. It is found in texts of Alexandrian,[69] Palestinian,[70] and Antiochene[71] type, and already in the anaphoral intercessions of *ApConst* VIII, 12:40, it concludes the opening petition for Church and hierarchy:

> Ἔτι δεόμεθά σου, Κύριε, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας σου Ἐκκλησίας...καὶ ὑπὲρ πάσης ἐπισκοπῆς τῆς ὀρθοτομούντος τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας.[72]

The singular form of the commemoration is found consistently throughout the euchology ms tradition of CHR and BAS.[73] Apart from the Italo-Greek variant noted in the next section, all mss have the ekphonesis, and all without exception have it in the singular. To commemorate but the one immediate hierarch, obviously the early tradition, properly reflects the niceties of ecclesial koinonia in its pristine sense. The Church is a local communion expressed most perfectly in eucharistic koinonia, but by no means *just* in eucharistic koinonia, *pace* the romantic sacramentalism of some modern ecclesiologies. Church communion is also a koinonia of interlocking, hierarchically

[68] LEW 389.

[69] MK/Cyril, CUMING 32-3; LEW 121.18, 160.36ff; PE 108; Ethiopian, PE 145.

[70] JAS, PO 26.2:208.3-4; LEW 55.2-3; PE 252; SyrJAS 55.2-3; LEW 90.7-14; PE 272.

[71] Ur/EgBAS, DORESSE-LANNE 22-3; PE 354; CHR/BAS, LEW 336.1-6; APSyr, AS I.2:221-2 = PE 266; Armenian, LEW 440.30-32; Anaphora of Nestorius, PE 392.

[72] SC 336:200.

[73] WINKLER, "Interzessionen" II, 365-7.

ordered, canonically regulated ecclesiastical relationships, the faithful and their pastors with the bishop, the bishop with the metropolitan, the metropolitan with his superior, be he major archbishop, catholicos, patriarch, or pope.

This was not just liturgical usage. It was also Eastern Orthodox canon law, as can be seen, to give but one instance, in the synodal decision of February 24, 1197, under Patriarch George II Xiphilinos (1191-1198), regarding the diptychal commemorations in monasteries. Stauropegic or exempt monasteries were not subject to the local diocesan but directly dependent on patriarchal jurisdiction. In such foundations only the patriarch had the right "of the anaphora," i.e., to be named in the diptychs – ἡ ἀναφορὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος, as it was called. In other monasteries, only the local eparch was commemorated by name.[74]

One Greek witness from the diptychs-debate literature following the Union of Florence would seem to contradict this, however. Orthodox clergy from Crete had a tradition of firing off liturgical queries to the ecumenical throne.[75] So when the Bull of Union gave rise to new and intractable problems concerning the diptychal commemoration of the pope, as we saw above in section A.I.5, the Cretan Orthodox priest Michael Kalophrenas wrote to Patriarch Metrophanes II from Candia (Herakleion) sometime after July 10, 1440, to ask just how the unionist diptychal innovation was to be executed liturgically. For, he reports, some say

> that it is only for the deacon to commemorate the most blessed pope in the diptychs, and if there is no deacon, [he is] not [to be commemorated] at all. But we say that all priests [should commemorate him], and especially is it necessary to commemorate [him] in the sacred rite, after the Ἐξαιρέτως,[76] saying thus: Ἐν πρώτοις μνήσθητι, κύριε, τοῦ μακαριωτάτου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Εὐγε-

[74] *Jus canonicum Graeco-Romanum* 26, PG 119:888-89 = Reg 1185. See also Patriarch JOHN IX AGAPETUS (1111-1134), *Hypomena* of August 1133, to the stauropegic Monastery of Patmos, confirming the independence of the monastery and requiring "only the anaphora of the [patriarch's] name" in the liturgy: SAKKELION 320 = Reg 1005. On diptychal problems in Jacobite monasteries, see FIEY, "Diocèses" II, 384.

[75] Cf. V. LAURENT, "Le rituel de la proscomidie et le métropolite de Crète Elie," REB 16 (1958) 116-142.

[76] The presider's Marian ekphonesis opening the diptychs of the departed.

νίου πάπα Ῥώμης καὶ τοῦ ἁγιω⟨τάτου⟩ ἡμῶν πατριάρχου Μητροφάνους καὶ τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου ἡμῶν Φαντίνου: οὓς χάρισαι ταῖς ἁγίαις σου ἐκκλησίαις ἐν εἰρήνῃ σώους, ἐντίμους, ὑγιεῖς, μακροημ⟨ερεύοντας καὶ⟩ ὀρθοτομοῦντας τὸν λόγον τῆς σῆς ἀληθείας. This is how the archbishop of our city has taught us to commemorate the most blessed pope after the gospel and in the diptychs.[77]

This, however, can hardly be taken as representative of mainline Orthodox usage. For Crete was under the Venetians and their Latin hierarchy from 1210 until the Turkish conquest in 1669, when the Greek hierarchy was restored. So the archbishop mentioned, Fantinus Vallaresso (Valaresso, Vallaressius), a Venetian nobleman born ca. 1392, was the *Latin* archbishop of Crete (1425-1453),[78] and the cited text represents the attempt of the Orthodox lower clergy to chart a safe passage between Scylla and Charybdis.

Ultimately, however, a more centralized view of Orthodox church polity led to the interpolation of such "ladder" style hierarchical commemorations into the ekphonesis. This is not surprising. Though some would like to view as peculiarly "Roman" the pyramidal model of the Church as a single monolith, there have developed in the post-Byzantine period autonomous, autocephalous Orthodox Churches ruled by synodal or patriarchal regimes so rigidly centralized and autocratic as to make Roman shepherding look like "Little-Bo-Peep" by comparison. And since shifts in theological perception and ecclesial polity usually find reflection sooner or later in the liturgy, this pyramidal view of church polity has its liturgical echo in contemporary modifications of the remaining diptychal incipit of the anaphora cited above, modifications which have the presider pray not just for his immediate episcopal superior, but also, and first of all, for the ruling central authority of his Church.[79] One sees this, as I have said, not

[77] HOFMANN, CFDS III.3, doc. 37, p. 50.

[78] On him, see B. SCHULTZE (ed.), FANTINUS VALLARESSO, *Libellus de ordine generalium conciliorum et unione Florentina* (CFDS II.2, Rome 1944) xiii-xix.

[79] On this are pertinent the remarks of E. LANNE, *Irénikon* 42 (1989) 126. One must not, however, be deluded into thinking that Orthodox usage has remained entirely free of this pyramidism.

only in recent Roman editions of the Byzantine liturgical books,[80] but also in several modern Orthodox editions.[81]

2. *The Italo-Greek Peculiarity*

I believe Dom Anselm Strittmatter was the first to note in euchology mss of Italo-Greek provenance the "Italo-Greek peculiarity" in which the opening exclamation of the diptychs of the living is reduced to a general commemoration of the hierarchy, undoubtedly because of the fluid situation in S. Italy, caused by the competition between Latins and Greeks for ecclesiastical control.[82] The variant text consisted in simply repeating in the

[80] *Hieratikon* (Rome 1950) 137, 200; *Služebnik* (vulgate, i.e. Muscovite, recension, Rome 1956) 265, 381; *Liturgikon siest' Služebnik* (Ruthenian recension, Rome 1942) 255-6, 374. Dom Lanne (*loc. cit.* previous note) attributes the pyramidism in the Roman editions to Cyril Korolevsky. On that stormy petrel, Karalevsky, Korolevskij, or Korolevsky, a Frenchman, born Jean François Joseph Charon (1878-1959), who took his time deciding first what his name was, then how to spell it, see the biographical note of his more famous if equally headstrong and brilliant friend and countryman, likewise totally dedicated to the service of Catholicism, the papacy, and the Christian East, Eugène Cardinal TISSERANT, appended to K's posthumous work, *Métropolite André Szeptickyj 1865-1944* (Rome 1964) VII-XXVI. Whether Korolevsky was indeed responsible for this "pyramidism" in the Roman editions I am unable to confirm, but it is not implausible. K. was one of the principal members of the commission involved in preparing the (generally excellent) modern Roman editions, and he was by no means as free of "latinisms" and "uniatisms" – to use one his own favorite pejorative terms – as he himself thought. His proposals for the private recitation of the Byzantine office ("Un projet d'anthologe pour la lecture privée de l'Office divin," POC 3 [1953] 14-28, 105-18, 218-32, 323-40; 4 [1954] 33-50) and daily devotional celebration of the Byzantine eucharist ("Questions et réponses 8, 11, 12," *Stoudion* 4 [1927] 101-5, 169-71), as well as his reservations about the married priesthood ("L'uniatisme," *Irénikon-collection* nos. 5-6 [1927] 59-60), show that beyond cavil.

[81] *Služebnik* (Belgrade 1928) 153; *Služebnik* (St. Petersburg 1900) 153; *The Divine Liturgy according to St. John Chrysostom, with Appendices* (recension of The Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America, now the Orthodox Church in America [OCA], New York 1967) 69. On the gradual adaptation in Slavonic books of the "ladder" approach to this diptychal commemoration, see HUCULAK 319-26, who carefully reviews all Orthodox and Catholic recensions of the Slavonic liturgical books in use in Ukraine and Russia during the period under study. As Huculak shows, the earlier practice there was to commemorate only the bishop.

[82] STRITTMATTER, "Missa Graecorum," 84-5; cf. WINKLER, "Interzessionen" II, 365-7.

diptychal exclamation incipit the preceding general commemoration of the hierarchy in the text of CHR,[83] thus:

> Ἔτι παρακαλοῦμέν σε μνήσθητι Κύριε πάσης ἐπισκοπῆς ὀρθοδόξων τῶν ὀρθτομούντων τὸν λόγον τῆς σῆς ἀληθείας...καὶ παντὸς ἱερατικοῦ τάγματος.
>
> **Ἐκφώνως**· Ἐν πρώτοις μνήσθητι Κύριε πάσης ἐπισκοπῆς ὀρθοδόξων τῶν ὀρθτομούντων τὸν λόγον τῆς σῆς ἀληθείας.

This variant is found in at least twenty Italo-Greek mss from the tenth through the sixteenth centuries,[84] with two of them, codices *Ottoboni Gr. 344* (AD 1177) and the thirteenth-century *Ambrosiana 276 (E 20 sup.)*, giving both the traditional ekphonesis and the "Italo-Greek peculiarity," the latter ms doing so, for good measure, in reverse order.[85]

3. *The Placement of the Ekphonesis*

Among the oldest extant euchology mss of the ancient recension of CHR in both redactions, Italian and Constantinopolitan,[86] three place the ekphonesis slightly later in the anaphoral intercessions, after the petition for the city in the textus receptus.[87] They are, in chronological order, the Italo-Greek mss *Barberini Gr. 336* (f. 34r)[88] from the eighth century, the oldest extant Byzantine liturgical ms; the tenth-century *Grottaferrata Gb VII* (f. 10r),[89] equally Italian; and the eleventh-twelfth century codex *Sinai Gr. 961* (f. 25r) of the Constantinopolitan redaction. Since other reliable ancient witnesses to both redactions of the ancient recension such as the tenth-century codices *Sevastianov 474* (Constantinopolitan) and *Leningrad 226* (Italian) have the ekphonesis where it is in the textus receptus,[90] not too much need be made of this variant, especially since by this time the rest of the anaphora was in any case recited silently.

[83] LEW 388:28-31.

[84] STRITTMATTER, "Missa Graecorum," 84-5, 134-5 note K; JACOB, *Formulaire* 237; WINKLER, "Interzessionen" II, 365-6. Winkler points out that one 12th c. ms, Vatican codex *Chigi Gr. R.IV.2*, omits the Ἐν πρώτοις incipit and begins directly with Ἔτι μνήσθητι (*ibid.* II, 366).

[85] WINKLER, "Interzessionen" II, 365.

[86] On Jacob's organization of the mss of CHR into various families or ms traditions, see TAFT, *Great Entrance* xxxi-ii.

[87] I.e. after ἐν αὐταῖς in LEW 389.28. Cf. WINKLER, "Interzessionen" II, 363-4.

[88] LEW 335-6.

[89] PASSARELLI 75-6.

[90] KS 269, 301.

II. The Diaconal Diptychs

1. *The Euchology Manuscripts*

The vast majority of euchology mss, when they do not pass over the diaconal diptychs of the living in complete silence,[91] are content simply to place after the Ἐν πρώτοις ekphonesis the traditional rubric, Ὁ διάκονος. Τὰ δίπτυχα τῶν ζώντων.[92]

But this rubric does not prove that the diaconal diptychs were still proclaimed aloud at every liturgy: already in the eleventh-twelfth century codex *Sinai Gr. 962* the rubric specifies that they be done in silence,[93] as does the diataxis of Philotheus, cited below, section 4.c. For the diaconal diptychs of the living, though they never became completely obsolete, did undergo an evolution similar to those of the dead, transforming the diptychs into a silent remembrance of those for whom prayers were offered, leaving space for their names or even writing them in,[94] sometimes accompanied in Italian mss by the traditional formula, Μνήσθητι Κύριε τῶν δούλου σου/θεοῦ,[95] and ultimately confusing them with the anaphoral intercessions.[96]

a. Grottaferrata Gb IV:

Other Italian euchology mss give the actual text of a variant form of the diaconal diptychs. The earliest – indeed the oldest diptychal text

[91] E.g., as in 10th c. *Sevastianov 474*, *Leningrad 226*, KS 264, 292; 12th c. *Paris Coislin 214*; 13th c. *Sinai Gr. 966* and *1037*; 13-14th c. *Sinai Gr. 1036*; 14th c. *Ambros. 1090 (Z 257 sup.)*; 16th c. *Modena 19 (a.R.7.20; III.A.5)*, *Vat. Gr. 1213*; 17th c. *Sinai Gr. 1047* and *1049*; etc.

[92] Mss listed in Winkler, "Interzessionen" II, 368-73, to which numerous others could be added.

[93] *Ibid.* II, 369.

[94] E.g., the 10th c. *Grottaferrata Gb VII* f. 10v; 11th c. *Sinai Gr. 958* f. 21r, the roll *Parma 1217/2 (H.H.I.1)*; 13th c. *Ambros. 276 (E 20 sup.)* ff. 27r-28r; *Istanbul Patriarchal Library Panaghia Kamariotissa 140 (143)* (AD 1572) f. 7r.

[95] As in the 10th c. *Grottaferrata Gb XV* f. 9r; 11th c. *Messina Gr. 160*, CHR f. 38v, BAS f. 60v; 12th c. *Seymour Euchology* f. 35v; 12-13th c. roll *Vallicelliana Gr. 112 (G 70)*; 13th c. *Ambros 709 (R 24 sup.)* f. 94r; 14th c. *Ambros 167 (C 7 sup.)* f. 29r.

[96] This confusion is especially apparent in mss such as the 13th c. *Ambros. 276 (E 20 sup.)* ff. 27r-28r, which repeates the rubric as if it were simply the title of the presider's silent anaphoral intercessions: Winkler, "Interzessionen" II, 370 no. 78.

extant – is in codex *Grottaferrata Gb IV*, a tenth-century ms of the ancient Italo-Greek recension of CHR copied, doubtless, in a monastery somewhere in Southern Italy,[97] which gives on f. 24r:

> **Ἐκφώ⟨νως⟩** · Καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν αἰχμαλωσίᾳ ὄντων χριστιανῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν, τὴν εἰρήνην τὴν ἐπάνω δούς, ⟨καὶ ὑπὲρ⟩ σωτηρίας αὐτῶν, καὶ πάντων ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ κατεκειμένων, τοῦ φιλοχρίστου στρατοῦ, καὶ τοῦ περιεστῶτος λαοῦ, καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.
>
> Ἐν πρώτοις...
>
> **Τὰ δίπτυχα τῶν ζώντων** · Μνήσθητι κύριε τοῦ δούλου σου Ἰωάννου κληρικοῦ καὶ ἁμαρτολοῦ.

There follow immediately five lines of names, later scraped away.

b. Sinai Gr. 958:

The eleventh-century codex *Sinai Gr. 958*, a Sinai ms of the ancient Constantinopolitan redaction of CHR,[98] has just before the concluding doxology of the anaphora[99] the obviously diptychal incipit: **Ὁ διάκ⟨ονος⟩**. Καὶ τοῦ φιλο⟨χρίστου⟩ (f. 21r).

c. Oxford Bodleian Auct. E. 5. 13:

The early twelfth-century Oxford ms *Bodleian Auct. E.5.13* from St. Savior in Messina, already cited in chapter IV, section B.IV, gives in the same place, before the concluding doxology of the anaphora, a very abbreviated diaconal diptychal exclamation (f. 20v):

> **Καὶ ὁ ἀρχιδιάκονος ἢ ὁ διάκονος ἐκφωνεῖ** · Καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ προσκομίζοντος τὰ ἅγια δῶρα τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν καὶ πάν⟨των⟩.
>
> **Ὁ λαός** · Καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.[100]

d. The Textus Receptus:

With these sources we are already moving in the direction of the textus receptus canonized by the editio princeps of Doukas (Rome 1526) and later editions, cited in chapter I, section C.II. Late mss like the fifteenth-century *Ambrosiana 84 (B 15 sup.)* (f. 90v) and *Sinai Gr. 1919* (AD 1564) (f. 46v) have the abbreviated diaconal proclamation just as in Doukas – though *Ambros. 84* follows it by the rubric **Ὁ διάκονος**. Τὰ δίπτυχα τῶν

[97] Jacob, *Formulaire* 170-1.
[98] Jacob, *Formulaire* 214-6.
[99] LEW 337.20.
[100] Jacob, "Euchologe," 304.

ζώντων, doubtless indicating that the names were recited afterwards, in silence. We noted in chapter IV, section B.III, an analogous evolution in the diptychs of the dead: the diaconal lists, destined for public proclamation but eventually reduced to silent recitation, are confused with the silent anaphoral intercessions.

Here one sees a breakdown in the understanding of what the Byzantine diptychs really were: not just a remembrance of those for whom one wished to pray, but the public proclamation of those with whom the local Church held communion. This represents a move, observable above all but not exclusively in Southern Italy, towards what Edmund Bishop called the "parochial" style diptychs current in the West, and away from the "communion" diptychs prevalent in the pristine tradition of the Byzantine East.

But these developments in the euchology text of the presbyteral liturgy are largely secondary. To observe the evolution of the full Constantinopolitan diaconal diptychs of the living, once must turn to the sources of three other Byzantine liturgical books, the diakonikon, the diataxis, and the archieratikon.

2. *The Manuscripts of the Diakonikon*

a. Sinai Greek 1040:

The earliest liturgical source to provide an actual text of the Byzantine diptychs of the living is the twelfth-century Palestinian diakonikon, codex *Sinai Gr. 1040* (f. 45v). Written ca. 1166, probably for use in the Monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai, the diptychs of the living for CHR name as reigning sovereigns Emperor Manuel I Comnenus (1143-1180) and his consort Mary of Antioch, whom he married at Christmas in 1161. Here is the text:

> **Ὁ διάκονος**· Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος κατὰ διάνοιαν ἔχει ⟨καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν⟩.
>
> **Ὁ λαός**· Καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.
>
> **Ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐκφωνεῖ**· Ἐν πρώτοις μνήσθητι, Κύριε, τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου ἡμῶν ⟨**τοῦ δείνος**⟩, ὃν χάρισαι ⟨ταῖς ἁγίαις σου ἐκκλησίαις ἐν εἰρήνῃ σῶον ἔντιμον ὑγιᾶ μακροημερεύοντα καὶ ὀρθοτομοῦντα τὸν λόγον τῆς σῆς ἀληθείας⟩.
>
> **Ὁ διάκονος** ⟨**τὰ**⟩ **δίπτυχα τῶν ζώντων**· Νικηφόρου τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου πατριάρχου ἡμῶν Ἱεροσολύμων, θρόνου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, θρόνου Ἀλεξανδρίας, θρόνου Ἀντιοχείας, Πέτρου τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ ἀρχιεπισ-

κόπου, καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ προσκομίζοντος τὰ ἅγια δῶρα Κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν, ὁ δεῖνα τοῦ ἱερέως, τοῦ τιμίου πρεβυτερίου, τῆς ἐν Χριστοῦ διακονίας καὶ παντὸς ἱερατικοῦ τάγματος, καὶ ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας, κράτους, νίκης, διαμονῆς, τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ φιλοχρίστων ἡμῶν βασιλέων Μανουὴλ καὶ Μαρίας, καὶ ὑπὲρ εἰρήνης, καὶ εὐσταθείας τοῦ σύμπαντος κόσμου, καὶ πασῶν τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ θεοῦ ὀρθοδόξων ἐκκλησιῶν, καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀναρρήσεως καὶ ἀπολυτρώσεως τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν, τῶν αἰχμαλώτων, καὶ πάντων ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ κατακειμένων ὀρθοδόξων χριστιανῶν, καὶ ἐλέους θεοῦ ἐπιδεομένων, τοῦ φιλοχρίστου στρατοῦ, καὶ τοῦ περιεστῶτος λαοῦ, καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.

Ὁ λαός· Καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.[101]

Note that provision for naming a priest (τοῦ ἱερέως) after the hierarchy and just before the order of presbyters probably means that the diptychs could be used at a liturgy presided over by a presbyter. For although ἱερεὺς can, *per se*, also mean a bishop, later Byzantine Greek liturgical texts generally prefer the term ἀρχιερεὺς for priests in episcopal orders.[102] This conclusion will be confirmed by the sources cited in sections 3-4 below.

b. Paris Greek 2509:

The diptychs of the living from the diakonika of CHR in the fifteenth-century codex *Paris Gr. 2509* (f. 232v), which from the names commemorated therein can be dated between 1427-1439, gives substantially the same Greek text as the twelfth-century diakonikon cited just above from *Sinai Gr. 1040*, except for a few verbal variants in the epithets, the naming of not only the emperor and his consort but also other royalty,[103] and the absence of the commemoration of those in tribulation (ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ) and the needy (ἐπιδεομένων).[104]

[101] Dmitr II, 134.

[102] A notable exception is the 12th c. pontifical diataxis I edited from codex *British Library Add. 34060*. See Taft, "Pontifical Liturgy" I, 296 note 50, 298 note 54, 402 note 64, and the corresponding Greek text to which the notes refer. Further text in *ibid.* I, 296 note 50.

[103] The nuns Hypomone († 1450), in secular life Irene, widow of Emperor Manuel II Paleologus († 1425), and Eugenia Cantacuzena, widow of Stefan Lazarević, Despot of Serbia († July 19, 1427: cf. *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije* V [Zagreb 1962] 500-1), are both named *before* Emperor John VIII Paleologus (1425-1448) and his consort Maria Comnena. Cf. LEW 551-2.

[104] Text and dating in LEW 551-2; Goar 81-2; variants from this ms given in the apparatus below in the *Excursus* at the end of this chapter.

3. *The Latin Version of Leo Tuscan*

A Constantinopolitan witness to substantially the same text is found in the version of the presbyteral liturgy by Leo Tuscan (1173-1178)[105] a decade after the witness of codex *Sinai Gr. 1040*. The text begins with the Ἐν πρώτοις, and commemorates the same Emperor Manuel I named in the *Sinai Gr. 1040* diptychs just cited:

> *Exaltat [sacerdos] uocem*: In primis memento, domine, archyepiscopi nostri *talis*, quem concede sanctis tuis ęcclesiis in pace saluum, honorabilem, sanum, in longitudinem dierum et recte tractantem uerbum ueritatis tuę.
>
> *Post hanc sacerdotis pronuntiationem diaconus qui sanctum euangelium dixit,*[106] *acutiori uoce profert hęc, si fuerit aliqua magna festiuitas*:
>
> Michahel sanctissimi et uniuersalis patriarchę longa sint tempora, Eleutherii Alexandrię, Cyrilli Antiochię, Leontii Ierosolimorum longa sint tempora. Et pro offerente sancta munera hęc domino deo nostro sacerdote, uenerabilis presbyterii eius, quę in Christo est ministrationis, et omni sacerdotali ordine. Et pro imperio, uictoria et perseuerantia piissimorum et in Christo dilectorum imperatorum nostrorum Manuel et Marię, Alexii magni imperatoris et Porphyrogeniti. Et pro pace et bono statu totius mundi et sanctarum ęcclesiarum et pro redemptione fratrum nostrorum captiuorum et pro ea quę Christum diligit milicia et pro circumstante populo et pro uniuersis fidelibus deum deprecemur.
>
> *Et populus id idem acclamat.*[107]

Since what the people also acclaimed must have been the traditional ending, καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν, repeated by them in all other extant Greek diptychal texts, that is doubtless what Tuscan loosely translates "et pro universis fidelibus," though where he gets the finale "deum deprecemur" is a mystery, since τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν is not the traditional ending of any diptychs I have seen.

[105] On this text, see chapter IV, section B.II.1. For the fact that it is a presbyteral eucharist, see the text in JACOB, "Toscan," *passim*, and ID., "Concélébration," 250, 254.

[106] See note 47 in the previous chapter.

[107] JACOB, "Toscan," 156. Jacob (*ibid.* 114) identifies those named: Constantinopolitan patriarch Michael III of Anchialos (Jan. 1170-March 1178), Melkite patriarchs Eleutherius of Alexandria (ca. 1180) and Cyril II of Antioch (1173?-1179?), Leontius II of Jerusalem (ca. 1174/5-May 1184/5) – on the patriarchs cf. FEDALTO I, 7; II, 584, 685, 1003 – Emperor Manuel I Comnenus (April 8, 1143-Sept. 24, 1180), Mary of Antioch, Manuel's consort as of Christmas 1161, and Alexius II Comnenus, born Sept. 10, 1169, and associated with the imperial authority from March 4, 1171.

Note also, at the beginning of the diaconal exclamation in Tuscan, the contamination of the diptychal text with the traditional "longa sint tempora" (εἰς πολλοὺς χρόνους, πολλοὶ ὑμῖν χρόνοι) proper to the acclamations at the beginning of the liturgy.[108] The same confusion is found in the Slavonic sources cited below in section B.III.4-7, where the diptychs are called (wrongly) *fimi* or *poxvala*.

Just what Tuscan means by "magna festiuitas" is moot. The later terminology "Great Feasts" (αἱ μεγάλαι ἑορταί) was at that time still foreign to Byzantine liturgical sources, before the final formation of the last generation or "Sabaitic" typika.[109]

[108] See chapter I, section A no. 3.

[109] For instance, JOHN OF EUBOIA (ca. 744), *Sermo in conceptionem s. Deiparae* 10, PG 96:1473C-6A, mentions ten "significant feasts (εὐσήμαι ἑορταί)" — I owe this reference to Alexander Kazhdan. The Studite-type monastic *Typikon of St. Savior of Messina* (AD 1131), contemporary with the Tuscan's version, uses the terms "feast, to feast" (ἑορτή, ἑορτάζειν) and "commemoration" (μνήμη) for liturgical solemnities of the fixed cycle. The principal feasts are "dominical" (δεσποτικαί), and their akolouthia takes precedence even when the feast falls on a Sunday: Nativity Dec. 25, Theophany Jan. 6, Hypapante Feb. 2, Transfiguration Aug. 6, Exaltation of the Cross Sept. 14; or Marian (τῆς θεοτόκου), to which the Sunday akolouthia does not give way: Mary's Nativity Sept. 8, Entrance into the Temple Nov. 21, Dormition Aug. 15. See ARRANZ, *Typicon* 398. Earlier, in the 10th c. Typikon of the Great Church, the chief feasts, though there was no special term for them, included at least 1) the major solemnities of the movable cycle: Palm Sunday and the Sunday before it, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost with its preceding and following Sundays; and 2) the other feasts with παραμονὴ (vigil) and παννυχὶς (solemn compline) on the vigil, on the feastday itself, or on both: Mary's Nativity, Exaltation of the Cross, the Dedication of the Church of the Theotokos in Chalcoprateia (Dec. 18) and of Hagia Sophia (Dec. 23), Christmas, Theophany, Hypapante, Annunciation (March 25), the Birthday of Constantinople (May 11), Sts. Peter and Paul (June 29), the commemoration of the 630 Fathers gathered at Chalcedon (July 16), Transfiguration, Dormition, New Year (Sept. 1), and, in each church, the feast of its dedication. See J. MATEOS, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église. Ms. Saint-Croix no. 40, Xe siècle. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes*, 2 vols. (OCA 165-166, Rome 1962-1963) II, 294, 311. In later Byzantine parlance, αἱ μεγάλαι ἑορταὶ means at least Easter plus the so-called "Twelve Great Feasts," seven dominical (Δεσποτικαὶ ἑορταί): Exaltation of the Cross, Christmas, Theophany, Palm Sunday, Ascension, Pentecost, Transfiguration; and five Marian (Θεομητορικαὶ ἑορταί): Mary's Nativity, Entrance into the Temple, Hypapante, Annunciation, Dormition. But until the final fixation of the Byzantine Rite and even later, there remains considerable variety as to whether certain feasts such as Hypapante or Annunciation are dominical or Marian. On the various stages in the formation of the Byzantine Rite, see TAFT, "Mt. Athos."

Of special interest from a liturgical point of view is Tuscan's witness to the diptychs being proclaimed not just at patriarchal or hierarchical liturgies, but also at eucharists presided over by presbyters, at least on more solemn occasions.

4. *The Diataxeis*[110]

a. Moscow Synod Greek 381 (275):

The Athonite monastic diataxis of codex *Moscow Synod Gr. 381 (275)*, originally from the Monastery of Vatopedi,[111] has diptychs substantially the same as the text given above from *Sinai Gr. 1040* a century earlier. They can be dated ca. 1285-1309 from their naming of Patriarch Athanasius I (1289-1293, 1303-1309), Emperor Andronicus II Paleologus (1282-1328), and his consort Irene whom he married in 1285.[112] Bishop Niphon, the diocesan named, is undoubtedly the Niphon who was bishop of Hierissos and the Holy Mountain (Mt. Athos), a suffragan see of Thessalonika, some time before 1314.[113]

The only notable item is the naming of the presiding presbyter, Hieromonk Ioannikios, in the diptychs, proving again, as in Tuscan and other sources of the medieval diptychs, that originally the diptychs were not, as today, a peculiarity of the pontifical rite. This confirms my codicil to Baumstark's "law of the preservation of older usages in the *temps forts* of the liturgical year."[114] As I have shown in other writings, it can also be extended, *mutatis mutandis*, to less-frequently celebrated ceremonies such as the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts and the pontifical rite.

b. Vatican Greek 573:

The fourteenth-fifteenth diataxis in codex *Vatican Gr. 573* also has the full diaconal diptychs at the presbyteral liturgy, with no variants worthy of note beyond the customary variety of epithets.[115]

[110] On this genre of liturgical book, see chapter IV, section B.II.2 at note 59.

[111] KM 17.

[112] KM 18.

[113] FEDALTO I, 442.

[114] A. BAUMSTARK, "Das Gesetz der Erhaltung des Alten in liturgisch hochwertiger Zeit," *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 7 (1927) 1-23; ID., *Comparative Liturgy* (Westminster Md. 1958) 27ff.

[115] KM 111.

c. Vatopedi 133 (744):

The fourteenth-century redaction of Philotheus' diataxis[116] in the Athonite codex *Vatopedi 133 (744)* is our first sign of a move away from the full diptychs at the presbyteral service. It provides for two sorts of diaconal diptychs, for the presbyteral and pontifical eucharist. If a bishop is presiding – Εἰ δὲ λειτουργεῖ καὶ ἀρχιερεύς, ἐκφωνεῖ ὁ διάκονος τότε πρὸ πάντων – then the full lists follow, without notable variants from what we have seen above in the other sources. But if a presbyter is presiding, the deacon just remembers *secretly* the hegumen, the monastic brotherhood, and whomever else he wishes: ὁ διάκονος μνημονεύει τε ἡγουμένου καὶ τῆς ἀδελφότητος καὶ ἑτέρων ζώντων ὧν βούλεται καθ' ἑαυτόν.[117] The redaction of Philotheus in the fourteenth-fifteenth century codex *Sinai Gr. 2046* (f. 19v) has the same specification.

5. *The Editio Princeps of the Melkite Qundāq*[118]

The 1701 Melkite editio princeps of the Arabic liturgikon or *qundāq* provides some interesting variants. After the Ἐν πρώτοις, ekphonesis, the following diptychs of the living are given in Greek and Arabic:

> **(Τοῦ δεῖνος)** τοῦ μακαριωτάτου καὶ ἁγιωτάτου, πατέρος (*sic*) πατέρων, ποιμένος ποιμένων, ἀρχιερέως ἀρχιερέων, τρίτου καὶ δεκάτου τῶν ἀποστόλων, πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ πατριάρχου τῆς μεγάλης θεουπόλεως Ἀντιοχείας, καὶ πάσης Ἀνατολῆς, πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη. **(τοῦ δεῖνος)** Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, **(τοῦ δεῖνος)** Ἀλεξανδρείας, **(τοῦ δεῖνος)** Ἱεροσολύμων, τῶν εὐσεβῶν καὶ ὀρθοδόξων πατριαρχῶν, πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη.
>
> Καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ προσκομίζοντος τὰ τίμια καὶ ἅγια δῶρα ταῦτα Κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν, τοῦ τιμίου πρεβυτερίου, τῆς ἐν Χριστοῦ διακονίας, τῶν συμπαρόντων ἱερομονάχων, ἱερέων τε καὶ ἱεροδιακόνων, καὶ παντὸς ἱερατικοῦ τάγματος, καὶ μοναχικοῦ σχήματος, καὶ τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν. Ὑπὲρ εἰρήνης τοῦ σύμπαντος κόσμου, εὐσταθείας τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησιῶν, ἀναρρύσεως καὶ αἰχμαλώτων, σωτηρίας τε καὶ βοηθείας τοῦ περιεστῶτος λαοῦ, καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.[119]

Note here too, in the first paragraph, the contamination of the diptychs by the φήμη or *ad multos annos* acclamations proper to the introit

[116] On this document see chapter IV at note 59.

[117] KM 68.

[118] On this source see chapter IV, section B. V.

[119] *Kitāb* (see chapter IV, note 89) 145-6, cited from KOROLEVSKY, Le rite byzantin," 552-3; ID., *Histoire* III, 64-5.

of the Constantinopolitan eucharist,[120] a contamination found as early as the version of Leo Tuscan (1173-1178) just cited, as well in the later Slavonic sources cited in the next section, and canonized in the modern diptychs published in 1894 by the Patriarchal Press of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem.[121] The second paragraph is simply a variant reading of the basic diptychal text already seen just above (section B.II.2.a-b) in codices *Sinai Gr. 1040* and *Paris Gr. 2509*.

So the meagre extant evidence from the euchology and diakonikon shows a relatively stable tradition for the text of the Byzantine diptychs of the living – as, indeed, is the case with most Byzantine liturgical texts of the Divine Liturgy throughout the ms tradition.

III. Later Refinements in the Pontifical Diptychs

Printed editions of the ἀρχιερατικόν or Greek pontifical are sparse, almost rubricless texts with no diptychs provided.[122] The archieratikon, after all, was the bishop's book, and it was the deacon who needed the diptychs. He read them from a separate diakonikon source of the type seen above in section B.II.2.[123] Some oriental and Slavonic sources of the pontifical liturgy, however, do provide diptychal texts that assist us in tracing the later developments of this liturgical unit in the pontifical liturgy.

1. *The Early Arabic Version of CHR*

The earliest extant text of the diptychs in a pontifical liturgy is the Arabic version of CHR based on a codex dated AD 1260,[124] but reflecting

[120] See chapter I, section A no. 3.

[121] Text in LEW 503.

[122] Cf. the editio princeps, Antonio Bartoli (Venice 1714) 8-9, 22, 24; the ed. of Constantinople (1820) 7-8, 19-20; of Athens (1902) 9-10, 23-4.

[123] See also the modern diptychs cited above in chapter I, section C.III.2.

[124] Bacha 405.

the state of the liturgy as it was in the eleventh century.[125] Bacha's French translation gives the diptychs as follows:

> *Le diacre*: Et de toutes les intentions de chacun.
>
> *Le peuple*: Et de tous et de toutes.
>
> *Le prêtre élève la voix*: Souvenez-vous en premier lieu, Seigneur, de notre archevêque... (= the usual Ἐν πρώτοις ekphonesis).
>
> *Le diacre*: [Souvenez-vous] du patriarche d'Antioche, du patriarche de Constantinople, du patriarche d'Alexandrie, du patriarche de Jérusalem, des respectables prêtres, des diacres serviteurs du Christ, de tout l'ordre sacerdotal; de nos rois croyants; de la prosperité du monde entier et des saintes Églises; du salut de nos frères prisonniers; de l'armée amie du Christ et de ce peuple ici présent.[126]

The original Greek behind the Arabic is easily reconstructed on the basis of the later Greek diptychs:

> **Ὁ διάκονος**· Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος κατὰ διάνοιαν ἔχει καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.
>
> **Ὁ λαός**· Καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.
>
> **Ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐκφωνεῖ**· Ἐν πρώτοις μνήσθητι, Κύριε, τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου ἡμῶν (**τοῦ δεῖνος**) ὃν χάρισαι ταῖς ἁγίαις σου ἐκκλησίαις ἐν εἰρήνῃ σῶον ἔντιμον ὑγιᾶ μακροημερεύοντα καὶ ὀρθοτομοῦντα τὸν λόγον τῆς σῆς ἀληθείας.
>
> **Ὁ διάκονος**· πατριάρχου Ἀντιοχείας, πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, πατριάρχου Ἀλεξανδρίας, πατριάρχου Ἱεροσολύμων, τοῦ τιμίου πρεβυτερίου, τῆς ἐν Χριστοῦ διακονίας καὶ παντὸς ἱερατικοῦ τάγματος, τῶν πιστῶν βασιλέων ἡμῶν, καὶ ὑπὲρ εὐσταθείας τοῦ σύμπαντος κόσμου καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἐκκλησιῶν, καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀναρρήσεως καὶ ἀπολυτρώσεως τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν τῶν αἰχμαλώτων, τοῦ φιλοχρίστου στρατοῦ, καὶ τοῦ περιεστῶτος λαοῦ (καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν).
>
> **Ὁ λαός**· Καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν).

This text is but a slightly less developed redaction (certain epithets and phrases are lacking) of the later extant texts in *Sinai Gr. 1040* and *Paris Gr. 2509* cited above in section B.II.2.a-b. As in those texts, the reigning local patriarch within his own patriarchate – in this case Antioch – has precedence over all others, even those of higher ranking sees, and so is named first among four the Orthodox incumbants of the pentarchy.

[125] JACOB, *Formulaire* 297-300.

[126] BACHA 463-4.

2. *The Archieratikon of Gemistos*

The next pontifical to give diptychs,[127] the archieratikon composed ca. 1380 by the deacon Demetrius Gemistos, notary under Patriarch Philotheus Kokkinos (1353-55, 1364-76, †1379) and later protonotary of the Great Church, is a pontifical diataxis describing the patriarchal rite of Hagia Sophia. It gives the following variant ekphonesis for the pontifical liturgy:

> Πρὸ δὲ τοῦ εἰπεῖν τὸν πατριάρχην τὴν ἐκφώνησιν ταύτην· *Μνήσθητι, Κύριε, πάσης ἐπισκοπῆς*, λέγει εἷς τῶν διακόνων ἔνδοθεν· *Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος κατὰ ⟨διάνοιαν ἔχει καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν⟩*. Ἰστέον δέ, ὅτι, εἰ ἀρχιερεύς ἐστιν ὁ λειτουργῶν, λέγει· *Ἐν πρώτοις μνήσθητι, Κύριε, τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου*. Καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐκφώνησιν λέγει ὁ διάκονος τὰ δίπτυχα.[128]

In short, if the patriarch himself is the presiding celebrant, one of the deacons within the chancel (as in the version of Tuscan cited above in section B.II.3) first exclaims: "And for those whom each one has in mind, and for each and all." Then the patriarch commemorates the hierarchy, but not "First of all," since it is only *he* who is commemorated "first of all" in his patriarchate. Instead, he exclaims: "Remember, Lord, all Orthodox bishops, ⟨whom grant to your churches in peace, safe, honorable, healthy, long-lived, and⟩ rightly handling the word of your truth."[129] But if another bishop – one of the metropolitans of the Permanent Synod of the Great Church, one of the numerous absentee-bishops in residence in the capital, one of the constant stream of visitors, especially on the occasion of a synod – is presiding, then he commemorates the patriarch with the customary "First of all..." formula. Only then does the deacon on the ambo[130] proclaim the diaconal lists of the living.

[127] The earlier pontifical diataxis in codex *British Library Add. 34060* skips from the creed (**VII.5**) to the opening blessing of the precommunion rites after the anaphora (**VIII.1**), and so does not indicate any diptychs: TAFT, "Pontifical Liturgy" I, 298-9. The same is true of the pontifical diataxis in the Athonite *St. Andrew Skete Codex* (DMITR I, 171). Doubtless, these sources pass over the diptychs in silence because they skip the entire anaphora, which has little ceremonial detail needing canonization in rubrics. I give a relatively full list of extant sources of the pontifical liturgy in TAFT, "Pontifical Liturgy" II, 90-7.

[128] DMITR II, 314; cf. WINKLER, "Interzessionen" II, 366. Later Greek sources in ORLOV 242-6; TREMPELAS 116-7 report basically the same tradition.

[129] The text gives only the incipit, and some sources give the longer, others the shorter redaction of this exclamation, i.e., without the bracketed section.

[130] See section VI below.

3. *The Diary of Archdeacon Paul of Aleppo*

Boulos az-Za'īm ibn 'Abd al-Masīḥ, known to us as Archdeacon Paul of Aleppo († 1669), son of Melkite Patriarch of Antioch Macarius II ibn az-Za'īm (1647-1672), accompanied his father on an extensive journey through the Orthodox East in 1652-1659, carefully recording in his diary the local ecclesiastical customs and ritual peculiarities he observed.[131] Among the services he described was the patriarchal eucharist in the Cathedral of St. George, Constantinople, on Christmas day, 1652. Here is the description of the diptychs of the living in *Voyage* I, 2:13:

> Then the patriarch of Constantinople says, *Remember, Lord, all faithful and pious prelates.* Then the first of the metropolitans, that of Ephesus, to his right, says, *First of all remember, Lord, the patriarch of Constantinople...* in full. Then the Great Oeconomos of Antioch is instructed to commemorate the name of our patriarch [i.e., of Antioch]. Each metropolitan on the right mentions the name of the patriarch of Constantinople, and the five [metropolitans] on the left, that of Heraclea and those with him, [all] mention the name of the patriarch of Antioch, right to the last one, and likewise the priests, one after another. Then the archdeacon says the diptychs of the patriarchs: *His holiness Paisius, ecumenical patriarch, for many years! Ioannicius of Alexandria, Macarius of Antioch, Paisius of Jerusalem*, – then he mentions the priests and officiating metropolitans.[132]

The patriarch of Antioch Macarius II is commemorated in the presiders' exclamations at this liturgy in Constantinople only because he was present and, probably, concelebrating. Note, too, the repetition of the ekphonesis commemorating the patriarchs, an innovation that will be adopted in later sources, Greek[133] and Slavonic,[134] though not in the printed

[131] On this document and its author, see GRAF III, 110-2; TAFT, "Pontifical Liturgy" II, 92 no. 23, and the introduction in Radu's unfinished edition cited in the following note.

[132] B. RADU (ed.), *Voyage du patriarche Macaire d'Antioche. Texte arabe et traduction francaise*, PO 22.1, 24.4, 26.5 (incomplete); here 22.1:130-1. The patriarchs named reigned as follows: Paisius of Constantinople (1652-1653), Ioannicius of Alexandria (1643-1665), Macarius III of Antioch (1647-1672), Paisius of Jerusalem (1645-1650); cf. FEDALTO I, 11; II, 585, 686, 1004.

[133] See TREMPELAS 123 (apparatus), plus the witnesses in sections 4-5 below.

[134] *Čin archierejskago dejstva* f. 25v; *Dejanija* f. 57v; not, however, in the *Činovnik of Cholmogory* (16-7).

books.[135] Also noteworthy is the order in which the patriarchs are proclaimed in the ekphonesis:

1. "First of all" Constantinople, not because of rank in the pentarchy, but because he is presiding within his own patriarchate.
2. Second, Antioch, because he was present and concelebrating, even though his pentarchial rank is third, after Alexandria.

So precedence is given to a patriarch presiding within his own jurisdiction and, after him, to another patriarch present at the service, regardless of their respective rank in the pentarchy. In the diaconal lists, however, the pentarchial order is preserved: Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem.

4. *The Proskinitarij of Arsenij Suxanov*

The Jerusalem patriarchal liturgy described by Russian Starec Arsenij Suxanov gives the same usage.[136] Arsenij's meticulously detailed account of his four-year (1649-1653) long "liturgical pilgrimage" throughout the Orthodox East it is one of the many documents occasioned by the Nikonian reform of the Muscovite liturgical books.[137] While on a visit to Moscow in 1649, Patriarch Paisius of Jerusalem (1645-1660), the same one named in the diptychs of the previous document, unsettled his hosts by informing them that their liturgical usages departed from those of the rest of Orthodoxy. So they sent Hieromonk Arsenij, superior of the Trinity-Sergius Annunciation Monastery, off to Jerusalem to observe things first-hand and report back on what he saw. They could not have chosen a better man for this embassy. In his "liturgical diary" suitably entitled *Proskinitarij, The Worshipper*, Arsenij, in Jerusalem in 1651-52, describes in great detail the services he observed, including the *čin (ordo)* of the patriarchal

[135] *Činovnik* (Moscow 1798) f. 39v, (Warsaw 1944) ff. 13v-14r.

[136] Full background and references in TAFT, "Pontifical Liturgy" II, 92-3 no. 24. On Arsenij's life and works, see esp. S. BELOKUROV, *Arsenij Suxanov*, CtOIDR (1891) 1-2, (1894) 2; ID, "Materialy dlja istorii Russkoj Cerkvi," *Xristianskoe čtenie* (1883) 2:670-738.

[137] On this reform, see references in TAFT, "Pontifical Liturgy" II, 93; and esp. P. MEYENDORFF, *Russia, Ritual, and Reform. The Liturgical Reforms of Nikon* (forthcoming from St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, Crestwood N.Y.), which revolutionizes the received views of the nature of this reform.

liturgy in the Basilica of the Anastasis celebrated by Patriarch Paisius himself.[138] Here is what he says of the diptychs:

> After the completion [of the Theotokion Ἄξιόν ἐστιν[139]] the archdeacon, standing near the doors, exclaims: Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος κατὰ διάνοιαν ἔχει καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.[140] And the people sing: Καὶ πάντῶν καὶ πασῶν. And the patriarch also says: Μνήσθητι, Κύριε, πάσης ἐπισκοπῆς ὀρθοδόξων τῶν ὀρθτομούντων τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας. But *First of all remember, Lord, the patriarch*, they do not say at all. Rather, all the other concelebrants say, *First of all remember, Lord*, [and] commemorate their patriarch, and thus go round all [the concelebrants] in order, right up to the last one. Also the archdeacon standing near the royal doors reads the *fimi* (φήμη). And after the completion of the *fimi*, all in the church sing Καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.

The use of the term φήμη reveals, again, the confusion between acclamations and diptychs, plus a contamination of the diptychal text by the acclamations already seen in the version of Leo Tuscan and repeated with ever greater frequency in later sources.

5. *The Diataxis of Patriarch Athanasius III*

This was undoubtedly common usage. It is also enshrined in the diataxis of Athanasius III Pattelaras (Patellarios), patriarch of Constantinople for two weeks, March 7-21, 1634, and again for a few days in 1652. Athanasius composed his diataxis in Moscow, in 1653, at the request of the Russians then engaged in the Nikonian reform of the Muscovite liturgical books.[141] Athanasius' rubrics were translated into Slavonic and incorporated

[138] IVANOVSKIJ 249-79. On the *Proskinitarij* and its mss, see S. BELOKUROV, "O rukopisjax sočinenij Suxanova," at the end of ID., *Arsenij Suxanov* ČtOIDR (1891) 2: CXXXVIII-CXLVIII (on the *čin*, CXLVI nos. 26.6, 27). The *čin* was soon excerpted from the *Proskinitarij* and included in mss separately, as a pontifical diataxis. Cf. *Čin božestvennija služby...* in the 17th c. codex *Moscow Synod Slav. 369 (698)* ff. 65-96, K. NEVOSTRUEV, K. GORSKIJ, *Opisanie slavjanskix rukopisej Moskovskoj Sinodal'noj Biblioteki*, 4. vols. (Moscow 1855-1917) III.1:109-10.

[139] I.e. the refrain following the ekphonesis commemorating the Theotokos that once opened the diptychs of the dead. Cf. chapter IV, section B.VII.

[140] I give in Greek the texts Arsenij cites in Greek, in Slavonic transliteration.

[141] I describe this and other sources of the pontifical liturgy, in TAFT, "Pontifical Liturgy," II, 89-97, here no. 25, p. 94.

into the synodal acts of 1667, thus becoming the official pontifical diataxis of the Russian Church:[142]

> When the singers have stopped singing [the Ἄξιόν ἐστιν refrain in honor of the Theotokos], right away the archdeacon, standing in the doors a bit to the side, holding his orarion with the first three fingers of his right hand, facing the people, says: *i vsex i vsja* [καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν]. And the people sing: *i vsex i vsja*. The bishop too proclaims aloud, if the patriarch is there, this: *Remember, Lord, the whole episcopate of the Orthodox, rightly handling the word of your truth.* But if a metropolitan or another bishop [is presiding], he says: *First of all remember, Lord, our father and patriarch N., etc.* This the other concelebrants also say to the bishop, as often as desired. But the archdeacon says in a loud voice the great praise (*velikuju poxvalu*), facing the people: *Parthenius the most holy and ecumenical patriarch [of Constantinople], Paisius of Alexandria, Macarius of Antioch, Nectarius of Jerusalem, the pious and orthodox patriarchs, Ioasaf of Moscow and all the Russias who is offering these holy gifts to our Lord God, for the salvation of our most pious and most mild God-crowned Tsar and Great Prince Alexei Michailovich, autocrat of all Great and Little and White Russia*, and the rest as usual, and at the end those outside sing: *i vsex i vsja*.

6. *The Činovnik of Cholmogory*

Basically the same tradition – with the substitution of the Holy Synod for the patriarch after the Moscow patriarchate's suppression by Peter the Great in 1721[143] – is found in other Slavonic sources such as the description of the pontifical liturgy celebrated by the new archbishop Afanasij upon taking possession of his see, October 19, 1683, incorporated into the eighteenth-century *Činovnik* of the Spaso-Preobraženskij Cathedral of Cholmogory,[144] or the 1798 Moscow *Činovnik* (ff. 49r-50v).[145]

The *Činovnik of Cholmogory*, however, not only has the presider,

[142] *Dejanija* ff. 42r-63r, here 57v-58r.

[143] Peter (1682-1725) did not permit the election of a successor after the death of Patriarch Adrian (1690-1700) on October 15, 1700, but the patriarchal government was not officially replaced by the Ruling Synod until 1721.

[144] GOLUBCEV 13-30, here 25-6. Cholmogory is a northern town in the Archangel'skaja oblast', RSFSR, 75 km. southwest of Archangel'sk.

[145] See also the mss of Slavonic BAS cited in ORLOV 243-7, and the classic modern Russian Orthodox ceremonial manuals and the sources they cite: K. NIKOL'SKIJ, *Posobie k izučeniju ustava bogosluženija Pravoslanoj Cerkvi* (7th ed. St. Petersburg 1907) 438-39 note 3; S.V. BULGAKOV, *Nastol'naja kniga dlja svjaščennocerkovno-služitelej* (2nd ed. Xar'kov 1900) 850.

Archbishop Afanasij of Cholmogory, commemorate the Patriarch of Moscow with the customary "First of all," but also has the concelebrants repeat the same for the presider, Archbishop Afanasij of Cholmogory, though strictly speaking in a non-patriarchal pontifical service only patriarchs are remembered "first of all." However, this abuse would become customary in some local usages, as we have already seen in chapter I, section C.III.3.b.

7. *The Činovnik of Moscow, 1668*

More faithful to the original tradition in Gemistos is the earlier (Moscow 1668) *Čin arxierejskago dejstva Božestvennyx liturgij, i osvjaščenija antimijsov i cerkvej* (f. 26r-v), where the archdeacon opens the diptychs of the living before the presider's ekphonesis with the traditional opening phrase and response which, as we saw in the previous chapter, is actually the finale of the obsolete diptychs of the dead:

> *I o nixže inže kijždo vromyšle imeet, i vsex i vsja* (= Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος κατὰ διάνοιαν ἔχει καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν).
>
> (People): *I vsex i vsja* (Καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν).

IV. The Concession of the Anaphora to Abbots

One peculiarity of Muscovite usage not generally shared by the other Orthodox Churches is the concession of pontificalia (mitre, trikeria and dikeria) to archimandrites.[146] Inevitably, given the Russian propensity for ritual, including the multiplication of clerical titles and their ritual accoutrements, the same usage spilled over to the diptychs. Though the full Byzantine diaconal diptychs of the living were generally restricted to hierarchical liturgies, in Russian usage the diptychal "anaphora" was also conceded to the abbots (*arximandriti*) of the "principal (*pervoklassnyx*) monasteries."[147] Ironically, and surely unintentionally, this is actually a

[146] De Meester, *De monachico statu* 258.

[147] A.A. Dmitrievskij, "Otzyv o sočinenii M.I. Orlova, *Liturgija Svjatago Vasilija Velikago*," *Sbornik otčëtov o premijax i nagradax prisuždaemyx imp. Akade-*

return to earlier usage, when the diptychs were proclaimed also at liturgies presided over by a simple presbyter.

V. Variants in the Exclamation Καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν

The chief hesitation in the sources, especially but not exclusively of the pontifical liturgy, concerns the presence or not, as well as the form, of the diaconal exclamation and the people's response to it.[148] This was originally the finale of both diaconal lists, of the living and of the dead. Since the latter are now obsolete, their remaining extant finale now seems to introduce the former, at least in the fullest pontifical redaction of the diptychs, where this exclamation both opens and closes the Byzantine diptychs of the living, introducing the ekphonesis of the presider, and furnishing the finale of the diaconal diptychs:

Deacon: Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος κατὰ διάνοιαν ἔχει, καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν (*I o nixže imže kijždo vromyšle imeet, i vsex i vsja/o vsex i za vsja*).

People: Καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν (*I vsex i vsja/i o vsex i za vsja*).

As we have seen in the sources cited above, several witnesses omit the entire unit at the beginning of the diptychs. Those that do have it waffle between giving the diaconal exclamation in its entirety, or only its finale, καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν. At the end of the diaconal diptychs most sources have the deacon conclude the lists with at least the finale καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν, repeated by the people, though some have the deacon proclaim the fuller form here too.

Slavonic sources show the same hesitation.[149] As for the Slavonic variant *i vsex i vsja/i o vsex i za vsja*, they are but two grammatically different versions of the same Greek καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν, with the second variant favored even today in the pontifical rite.

VI. Where Were the Diptychs of the Living Proclaimed?

Where did the deacon proclaim the diptychs of the living? We saw that the diptychs of the departed were read within the sanctuary while the

mieju Nauk IV. Otčëty za 1909 g. (St. Petersburg 1912) 195-96 note 3. I am grateful to Prof. Dr. Rainer Stichel for kindly providing me with a photocopy of this work.

[148] See Winkler, "Interzessionen" II, 368-74.

[149] Huculak 319-26.

deacon incensed around the altar. But there were special reasons for this, in the association that linked the dead with the offering of incense and the sacrificial death of Jesus, whose recently-consecrated types were present on the altar on the diskos and in the cup. As for the diptychs of the living, all later rubrics have the deacon proclaim them at the open doors of the sanctuary, facing the people.

In earlier sources the only hint of where the deacon performed this ministry is an oblique one. Leo Tuscan's version, cited above in chapter IV, section B.II.1, says that the diptychs of the dead were proclaimed by the deacon who was in the sanctuary (*chorus*). But in the text cited in section B.II.3 of this chapter, the same document goes on to say that those of the living were executed *not* by this deacon, but by the one who had read the gospel. Where he performed this ministry is not specified, though one might infer that it was somewhere else than in the sanctuary, for the text implies there was only the one deacon there, and he was not the one who read the diptychs.

If not in the sanctuary, then where? Although the euchology and diataxis rubrics are totally silent on the topic, I would suspect that the diptychs of the living were proclaimed, originally, from the ambo, in larger churches like Hagia Sophia a huge, imposing structure in the center of the nave.[150] Not only was the ambo the normal place for such diakonika, proclaimed by the deacon facing east.[151] We also know that one deacon remained outside on the ambo during the anaphora – Leo Tuscan's "*extra stans diaconus*"[152] also referred to by other medieval Byzantine liturgical sources: tenth-century BAS in the eleventh-century *Pyromalus Codex*[153] and the corresponding Latin version of Johannisberg;[154] the archieratikon of Gemistos (ca. 1380).[155] It was probably he who proclaimed the diptychs of the living. Against this one might wish to argue that the rubrics of Gemis-

[150] See T.F. MATHEWS, *The Early Churches of Constantinople: Architecture and Liturgy* (University Park and London 1971) esp. 110, 178, plate 56, and *passim* (cf. "ambo" in the index); and the recent study of A. KAZHDAN, "A Note on the 'Middle-Byzantine' Ambo," *Byzantion* 57 (1987) 422-426; other references in TAFT, *Great Entrance* 312 note 2.

[151] See references in TAFT, *Great Entrance* 312-3.

[152] JACOB, "Toscan," 152.

[153] GOAR 156.

[154] G. WITZEL, *Liturgia S. Basilii Mag. nuper e tenebris eruta, et in lucem nunc primum edita* (Mainz 1546) f. e iiij r. On this and the previous source see TAFT, *Great Entrance* xxvi.

[155] DMITR II, 312.

tos' archieratikon have "one of the deacons inside (ἔνδοθεν)" exclaim what now serves as the opening of the diptychs, the Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος...καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν before the Ἐν πρώτοις ekphonesis.[156] But this does not necessarily contradict what I have said above, *since this diaconal exhortation is the old conclusion to the diptychs of the dead*, which were indeed read from within the sanctuary.[157]

CONCLUSION

From the evidence already adduced about the nature of the Byzantine diptychs of the living, these texts contain no surprises. The integral diptychs manifest the following shape:

1. The presiding celebrant initiates the commemorations with the Ἐν πρώτοις ekphonesis, commemorating his immediate hierarchical superior, the local diocesan.
2. If a patriarch is presiding, since he is the "first of all" within his territory, he commemorates the episcopate in general.
3. In that case, the concelebrating bishops then name the patriarch first, and, after him, any other patriarch present, regardless of his pentarchial rank.
4. Then, if it is a "Great Feast," the deacon who had read the gospel proclaims in a loud voice the diptychs from the ambo. In them, only the four patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, along with the local hierarch, the celebrant presiding at the liturgy, and the sovereigns, are actually *named*. Everyone else is included in a comprehensive formula or remembrance for those whom each one wishes to remember, specifically the orders of clergy: presbyterate, diaconate, monks, and the whole priestly order; for the peace and prosperity of the whole world and of the holy Churches, for the redemption of those in captivity and for others suffering, for the army, for those present at the service, for all Orthodox faithful throughout the world, and for each and everyone.

[156] *Ibid.* 314 cited in full above in section B.III.2.

[157] On this see the previous section (B.VI) of this chapter, and chapter IV, section B.II.1.

5. The lists conclude with the usual Καὶ ὧν εκαστος...καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.
6. To which the people reply, Καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.

Later, especially Italo-Greek sources, manifest a growing tendency to reduce the diaconal lists to silence, preserving at most a fragmentary general proclamation to introduce the silent commemoration of those for whom the deacon wishes to pray. This can be considered a move away from true Byzantine "communion" diptychs to the more "parochial" style local individual remembrances more common in the the West, though I see no evidence of any actual western influence behind this development.

EXCURSUS

THE GREEK TEXT OF THE DIACONAL DIPTYCHS OF THE LIVING

The following provides the base text of the Byzantine diaconal diptychs of the living from the earliest extant ms, codex *Sinai Gr. 1040* (Dmitr II, 134), ca. 1166, with variants from the known extant texts in other mss:

1. M = *Moscow Synod Gr. 275 (381)*, 13-14th century, KM 27.
2. VT = *Vatican Gr. 573* 13-14th century, KM 111.
3. VP = *Vatopedi 133 (744)*, 14th c. diataxis of Philotheus, KM 66, 68.
4. P = *Paris Gr. 2509*, f. 232v, AD 1427-39, LEW 551-2; Goar 81-2.

The Apparatus

1. Texts enclosed in pointed brackets ⟨ ⟩, not found in *Sinai Gr. 1040*, have been supplied by me at points where I presume the ms is providing only the incipit, as is very often the case in liturgical mss. The remainder of the text, added in brackets, has been reconstructed on the basis of what one sees in other sources across the tradition.
2. Where sources used in the apparatus give only the incipit, or omit the people's responses, their liturgical use is presumed and this absence is not noted in the apparatus.
3. Variants consisting merely in differences in the order of precedence of the pentarchial sees, since each patriarch is commemorated first in his own patriarchate, or from the titles of hierarchs – e.g. "Ecumenical Patriarch" for Constantinople – which are included in some texts and simply presumed in others, or from the names of the persons commemorated, are also ignored in the apparatus.
4. Ignored, too, are insignificant linguistic, orthographic, or grammatical differences (ὁ δεῖνος/ὁ δεῖνα/τοῦ δεῖνου), since what I am interested in here are the *liturgical* variants.
5. Where appropriate, I indicate in the apparatus textual parallels in CHR/BAS. Such parallels are unremarkable, since in most cases such intercessions are

composed of Formelgut material, stock phrases of the sort customarily found in Greek petitionary prayer across the traditions.

6. Unless otherwise specified, the text which the variant reading replaces or modifies opens with a bracket and closes with the footnote number. Where there is no bracket, the variant involves only the single word immediately preceding the number.

Text

1.Ὁ διάκονος[1]· Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος κατὰ διάνοιαν ἔχει ⟨καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν⟩.

2.Ὁ λαός· Καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν[2].

3.Ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐκφωνεῖ· Ἐν πρώτοις μνήσθητι, Κύριε, τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου ἡμῶν ⟨**τοῦ δεῖνος**⟩, ὃν χάρισαι ⟨ταῖς ἁγίαις σου ἐκκλησίαις ἐν εἰρήνῃ σῶον ἔντιμον ὑγιᾶ μακροημερεύοντα [καὶ[3] [*ὀρθοτομοῦντα τὸν λόγον τῆς σῆς ἀληθείας*[4].

4.Ὁ διάκονος ⟨τὰ⟩ δίπτυχα τῶν ζώντων.

5.Νικηφόρου τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου πατριάρχου ἡμῶν Ἱεροσολύμων, θρόνου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, θρόνου Ἀλεξανδρίας, θρόνου Ἀντιοχείας[5],

6.Πέτρου τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ ἀρχιεπισκόπου[6],

7.καὶ [ὑπὲρ τοῦ προσκομίζοντος τὰ ἅγια[7] δῶρα[8] Κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν, **ὁ δεῖνα** τοῦ[9] ἱερέως[10],

8.τοῦ τιμίου πρεσβυτερίου,

9.τῆς ἐν Χριστοῦ διακονίας

[1] VP Καὶ εἴπερ λειτουργεῖ καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς, ἐκφωνεῖ τότε αὖθις ὁ διάκονος.

[2] P om. **2-3**.

[3] Omitted in many mss.

[4] 2 Tim 2:15; CHR/BAS, LEW 332.7-9, 336. 10-12.

[5] M, an Athonite monastic diataxis from Vatopedi meant for use at a presbyteral liturgy within the patriarchate of Constantinople, names only the Ecumenical Patriarch before the local bishop / VP omit **4** / VT P om. **5** possibly because they were for use in a pentarchial see where the bishop was the patriarch himself.

[6] No. **6**: M read Νίφωνος τοῦ πανιερωτάτου ἐπισκόπου ἡμῶν δεῖνος / VP read Εἰ δὲ λειτουργεῖ καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς, ἐκφωνεῖ ὁ διάκονος τότε πρὸ πάντων· Ἰακώβου ἢ ἄλλου τινὸς ὀνόματος, τοῦ ἱεροτάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου ἡμῶν Ἱερισσοῦ καὶ ἁγίου ὄρους.

[7] Cf. BAS, LEW 332.15-16.

[8] VT add ταῦτα.

[9] VT add θεοβεστάτου / P add ἐντιμωτάτου.

[10] VP om τοῦ ἱερέως / M loco τοῦ ἱερέως read Ἰωαννικίου ἱερομονάχου / P add τῶν συμπαρόντων ἱερέων.

10.καὶ παντὸς ἱερατικοῦ τάγματος[11],

11.καὶ[12] ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας, κράτους, νίκης[13], διαμονῆς, τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ φιλοχρίστων[14] [ἡμῶν βασιλέων[15] Μανουὴλ καὶ Μαρίας,

12.καὶ[16] ὑπὲρ εἰρήνης, καὶ [εὐσταθείας[17] τοῦ σύμπαντος κόσμου,

13.καὶ[18] [πασῶν τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ θεοῦ ὀρθοδόξων[19] ἐκκλησιῶν[20],

14.καὶ[21] ὑπὲρ [ἀναρρήσεως καὶ ἀπολυτρώσεως[22] τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν τῶν αἰχμαλώτων,

15.καὶ πάντων ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ κατακειμένων ὀρθοδόξων χριστιανῶν καὶ ἐλέους θεοῦ ἐπιδεομένων[23],

16.[24] τοῦ φιλοχρίστου στρατοῦ,

17.καὶ[25] [τοῦ περιεστῶτος λαοῦ[26],

18.καὶ[27] πάντων καὶ πασῶν.

19.Ὁ λαός· Καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.

[11] Nos. **8-10** = BAS, LEW 336.23-6; CHR, LEW 332.10-12.
[12] M VT P VP om.
[13] VT VP P add καί.
[14] M θεοφυλάκτων.
[15] M VT VP P βασιλέων ἡμῶν.
[16] M VT VP P om.
[17] M VP P καταστάσεως.
[18] M VP om καὶ add εὐσταθείας.
[19] M VT VP P read τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ θεοῦ.
[20] Nos. **12-13** cf. Great Synapte, LEW 362.35-7.
[21] M VT VP P om.
[22] M VT VP P read ἀπολυτρόσεως.
[23] M VT VP P om **15**.
[24] M VP add ὑπὲρ εὐοδώσεως / VT P add εὐοδώσεως καὶ ἐνισχύσεως.
[25] M VT VP P om καὶ / M VP add ὑπὲρ συγχωρήσεως καὶ ἀφέσεως τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν / VT add σωτηρίας καὶ βοηθείας / P add σωτηρίας.
[26] BAS, LEW 334.3-4.
[27] P om.

CHAPTER VI

QUAESTIONES DISPUTATAE IN THE BYZANTINE DIPTYCHS: WHO, WHERE, AND IN WHAT SEQUENCE?

In this chapter I wish to address three remaining questions concerning the Byzantine diptychs:

1. Who had the right to be commemorated not just by inclusion in the general categories – living/deceased bishops, presbyters, deacons, clergy, sovereigns, faithful – but by having the deacon mention them by name?
2. Where, i.e. at what point of the eucharistic service, were the Byzantine diptychs originally proclaimed, during the anaphora, as now, or before it, as in certain other traditions in Late Antiquity?
3. What was their original order, i.e. which came first, the diptychs of the living, as in most traditions, or those of the dead, as in later Byzantine usage?

A. WHO WAS NAMED IN THE BYZANTINE DIPTYCHS?

If it is obvious that the dead were named in the diptychs of the dead, and the living in those of the living, that is the beginning, not the end of the problem. The real question is: which dead, which living were named? For it is equally obvious that not all the known living and dead, even of a small village eparchy of any antiquity, could have been commemorated individually, by name, in the diptychs. One is tempted to exclude *a priori* the reading of long and detailed lists as unthinkable because of the boredom moderns would experience at such a telephone-directory approach to liturgical commemorations. But we must not be anachronistic – nor, indeed, can one view things just through western eyes. In some Byzantine Orthodox Churches even today, lengthy lists of commemorations, often

lasting several minutes, are read during the Great Entrance.[1] And Nestorian and Jacobite diptychs, the *Books of the Living and Dead*, were extremely long. As J.-M Fiey, unparalleled historian of East-Syrian Christianity, has pointed out, these seemingly endless lists of confessors and martyrs enjoyed an important role in popular piety.[2] They and the dead hierarchs and notables of the community were local heroes, and the diptychs were part of the collective memory. As such, they were not only religious but civic commemorations as well, in a world in which such a distinction was in fact non-existent.

> One can see how the reading of such a text, which even the youngest knew by heart, and which no one found too long, was somewhat like the proclamation of the "Honor Roll" of the village, cementing once again the unity of the community, the little local church...within the bosom of the great East-Syrian Church.[3]

Still, there must have been some selectivity. In large towns, at least, the lists could hardly have included all the living and dead, probably not even all the dignitaries. Remember that this is the epoch of "cathedral liturgy," before the breakup of the local church into parishes, and worship in a town was still centered around the one liturgy of the bishop and his cathedral church.[4] In fact, though Latin sources do seem to imply such "parochial" lists – the *nomina offerentium* and *defunctorum*[5] – Edmund Bishop has observed that

> the popular, it may be said mere 'parochial,' use of diptychs for mere commonplace persons, as in the West, does not figure in such documentary evidence as has survived of specifically Eastern practice.[6]

[1] TAFT, *Great Entrance* 237 n. 35. More recent observation has confirmed the continuation of this practice.

[2] FIEY, "Diptyques," 408-9.

[3] "On divine que la lecture d'une telle pièce, que les plus jeunes mêmes connaissaient par coeur et que personne ne trouvait trop longue, était un peu comme la proclamation du livre d'or du village, cementant encore l'unité de la communauté, de la petite église [locale]...au sein de la grande Église syrienne orientale." *Ibid.* 409.

[4] See TAFT, *Hours* 297-8.

[5] BISHOP, "Appendix," 97-100, 112-3, and chapter II, sections A.II-III.

[6] BISHOP, "Appendix," 114.

I. The Diptychs of the Living

1. *Hierarchical Dignitaries*

If Bishop's conclusion may need to be nuanced for other Eastern Churches, for Byzantine usage there is no evidence of anyone but pentarchial patriarchs, the patriarch or chief herarchical authority (major archbishop, exarch, ruling synod), bishops, and the presiding celebrant among the clergy; and, among the laity, the emperors, their consorts, and other members of the imperial household; being literally *named*, i.e. commemorated by the presider or deacon actually calling out their proper name, as distinct from being included in a general mention of various *categories* or *classes*.[7]

Byzantine sources already adduced make it clear that in the diptychs of the living of the patriarchal sees, at least at liturgies presided over by the patriarch himself, all patriarchs of the pentarchy in communion with the local incumbant were named, a usage Theodore Balsamon, absentee patriarch of Antioch (*ante* 1189-*post* 1195) resident in Constantinople during the occupation of his see by a Latin incumbant, testifies to as the rule in his responses to Patriarch Mark of Alexandria (*ante* 1195-?).[8] But there is no evidence that at an ordinary presbyteral service, anyone but the presiding priest's immediate local hierarch, the eparchial bishop, and the presider himself, was named. The one exception was in monasteries that were stauropegic or had some other special status due to the terms of their foundation. Throughout Byzantine monastic law, the only names ever mentioned in this regard are the local bishop (or patriarch in stauropegic houses), rarely an exarch or hegumen-exarch, the emperor and empress, the founder, the protos in the Protaton of Karies on Mt. Athos – in short, only *dignitaries* with some special claim to "the anaphora."[9]

Actual naming to this extent would have posed no problem for the diptychs of the living, since the incumbant bishops of the pentarchy, the five patriarchal sees of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jeru-

[7] See EVAGRIUS SCHOLASTICUS, HE III, 34, BIDEZ-PARMENTIER 134 = PG 86.2:2673.

[8] *Responsa ad interrogationes Marci* 15, PG 138:968B.

[9] DE MEESTER, *De monachico statu* 463-4 = Index: "Nomen III. Commemoratio nominis in diptychis, collectis et acoluthis."

salem, are the only ones ever mentioned in the early Byzantine sources as being named in the diptychs of the patriarchal sees.

Does the correspondence between Anatolius of Constantinople and Leo the Great concerning the name of Eustathius of Berytus in the diptychs of the living[10] show that these names were not always restricted to the incumbents of the patriarchates? Since no other evidence for the diptychs of Constantinople supports such an inference, more likely at issue was the inclusion of Eustathius' name in *any* diptychs, even those of his own Church.

2. *The Sovereigns*

We have also seen evidence that the ruling sovereigns were named in the diptychs of the living, at least the emperor and his consort, a usage Maximus Confessor (†662) witnesses to explicitly in his *Relatio motionis* (AD 655): "he [the deacon] also commemorates the living emperors, after all the sacred ministers."[11] Some extant sources also include other members of the imperial family.[12] This practice lasted until the end of Byzantium, and even thereafter the imperial naming was passed on to the local ruler, such as the Russian Tsar.[13] To the end the Byzantines even pretended, without evident success, that the emperor be named in diptychs throughout the Orthodox world, beyond the effective political limits of the fast-shrinking empire. In his famous reply to Grand Prince Vasilij Dimitrievič (ca. 1350-†1403) of Moscow, patriarch of Constantinople Anthony IV (1389-90/1391-97) insists that the metropolitan "commemorate the divine name of the emperor in the diptychs" (ἵνα μνημονεύῃ τοῦ θείου ὀνόματος τοῦ βασιλέως ἐν τοῖς διπτύχοις) because the emperor

> is appointed (χειροτονεῖται) emperor and autocrat of the Romans, that is, of all Christians; and in every place and by every patriarch, metropolitan, and bishop, the name of the emperor is commemorated (μνημονεύεται τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ βασιλέως)...[14]

[10] Above in chapter V, section A.I.1.

[11] Acta I, 5, PG 90:117B, cited in full above, chapter IV, section A.II.3.

[12] See chapter V, section B.II.2.b, 3 and III.5.

[13] See the Slavonic sources cited above, chapter V, section B.III.5-7.

[14] MM II, 190.14, 3-33; trans. based on J. MEYENDORFF, "Mount Athos in the Fourteenth Century: Spiritual and Intellectual Legacy," DOP 42 (1988) 161.

II. The Diptychs of the Dead

1. *The Hierarchy*

The diptychs of the dead were another matter. Of course the names of all dead bishops of the Church in question, except those who had been stripped of this honor, would be read, as the sources cited in chapter IV testify. As for naming the deceased bishops of other sees, even just those of the pentarchy, recall that already in the pre-Chalcedonian period of our earliest evidence for the diptychs, when the oldest sees had been in existence only a few centuries, ancient and early medieval lists number forty-four legitimate popes and five antipopes as Leo I's (440-461) predecessors at Rome.[15] Those names, plus the complete lists of the four eastern patriarchal sees, would have made for tedious reading. Traditional Constantinopolitan catalogues list Atticus (406-425) as the thirty-fourth bishop of the Great Church.[16] Cyril (412-444) was the twenty-fourth pope of Alexandria.[17] Devreesse lists Theodotus (424-428), who caused the uproar by restoring Chrysostom's name to the diptychs, as thirty-eighth patriarch of Antioch.[18] And by the time of the diptychs dispute in 417, the see of Jerusalem had known forty-five Orthodox and three Arian incumbants.[19]

Now I find it hard to believe that a list of over 175 bishops' names were read even at solemn patriarchal liturgies of the four eastern pentarchial sees in the fifth century. The issue is not time – such a list could have been proclaimed in less than five minutes – but the point of it all. What purpose, liturgical or political, would it have served? But in the complete absence of any extant Constantinopolitan diptychs of the dead, we are at a loss to know exactly what was done in the early period.

The Palestinian diptychs of the dead for JAS in the diakonikon codex *Sinai Gr. 1040* ca. 1166 AD list only the dead patriarchs of Jerusalem

[15] *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 11:574-5.

[16] F. FISCHER, "De patriarcharum Constantinopolitarum catalogis et de chronologia octo primorum patriarcharum," *Commentationes philologicae Jenenses* 3 (1884) 262-333, esp. 286. FEDALTO I, 3, 15, however, lists only 18 Orthodox and Arian bishops, from Philadelphus (211-217) to Atticus.

[17] FEDALTO II, 581-2.

[18] R. DEVREESSE, *Le patriarcat d'Antioche depuis la paix de l'église jusqu'à la conquête arabe* (Paris 1945) 117. FEDALTO II, 681-2 lists him as the 31st Melkite Orthodox patriarch.

[19] FEDALTO II, 999-1001, 1005.

along with a variety of other saints, but not the other deceased pentarchial bishops.[20] And in spite of the endless palaver over inclusion or exclusion of dead bishops from the diptychs in the historical documents adduced in the preceding chapters, I suspect that the custom of Constantinople was similar, except perhaps on special occasions – for instance, during synods, or when delegates or representatives of the other pentarchial sees were in attendance or concelebrating at the service.

At any rate it was not the practice in lesser Churches to include outsiders in the list of dead bishops, as we saw in the only early source that actually gives us the list of a local Church, the acts of the Synod of Mopsuestia in 550, concerning the diptychs of that see.[21] The Mopsuestian diptychs of the dead were meant to include the names of the deceased bishops of the see of Mopsuestia only.

2. *The Sovereigns*

Regarding the naming of the sovereigns in the diptychs of the dead, the sources are meagre. Maximus Confessor (†662) in his *Relatio motionis* (AD 655) says the deacon proclaims the names of "Constantine, Constantius, and the rest," from which one could infer that all the deceased emperors from Constantine the Great on were named.[22] By then, of course, they numbered only twenty-one, half of whom would have been excluded from the diptychs anyway, as apostates, heretics, schismatics, trigamists, whatever. But by the time of the hagiopolite diptychs of JAS in Codex *Sinai Gr. 1040*, there had been sixty-eight emperors from Constantine I to John II Comnenus (1118-1143), the last emperor in the list of only nine named in that text.

The document contains twelve names, nine emperors and three consorts, as follows in the order in which they appear in the text: Constantine and Helena, Theodosius, Marcian, Basil, Constantine, Romanus, Michael the monk, John and Irene, Alexius and Irene. Even making allowance for those who would have been purged from the lists for crimes ecclesiastical, this list can hardly be considered an attempt to name all Orthodox sovereigns worthy of inclusion. Obviously, the diptychs were selective, the

[20] LEW 501-2, cited in chapter III, section A.I.

[21] See chapter II, section C.V.3.

[22] Acta I, 5, PG 90:117D. The entire text is cited, translated, and commented above, chapter IV, section A.II.3.

principle of selection being, apparently, to open the list with some of the early "greats," then to skip to the contemporaries. So I would construe this twofold list as follows:

1. **"Founding Fathers" of the empire:** Constantine I (324-327) and Helena, Theodosius I (379-395) the Great, Marcian (450-457), Basil I (867-886).
2. **The most recently deceased rulers:** Constantine X Ducas (1059-1067), [Eudocia (1067)], Romanus IV Diogenes (1068-1071), [Eudocia (1071)], Michael VII Ducas (1071-1078), [Nicephorus III (1078-1081)], then, out of order, Alexius I Comnenus (1081-1118) and Irene Ducas, John II Comnenus (1118-1143) and Irene of Hungary.

The diptych omits from this second category, the list of actual recent incumbants, those in brackets. Eudocia Macrembolitissa, niece of Patriarch Michael Cerularius and wife of both Constantine IX and Romanus IV, though twice locum tenens, was never really empress. As for Nicephorus III Botaneiates (1078-1081), both his succession and his marriage were questionable. When his predecessor Michael VII, forced to abdicate, became a monk, Nicephorus not only assumed the throne but caused a scandal by marrying Michael's wife, Mary the Alan, while Michael was still alive. Pope Gregory VII (1073-1085), the great Hildebrand, who remained faithful to Michael VII, did not accept this usurpation and excommunicated Nicephorus. So there were several reasons for refusing him the diptychal anaphora.[23]

III. The Inclusion of the Councils in the Diptychs

By the sixth century, diptychs had also come to function somewhat like the later Synodikon of Orthodoxy.[24] In Byzantine usage we see this for the first time at a synod held at Constantinople in 518, already discussed in chapter IV, section A.II.2. But apart from bishops and emperors, we

[23] Cf. J.M. Hussey (ed.), *The Cambridge Medieval History* IV.1 (Cambridge 1966) 207-12, 464

[24] The basic study is J. Gouillard, *Le Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie* (Travaux et mémoires 2, Paris 1967). Cf. Reg 425; Michel II, 1-21.

have no early evidence for any other *persons* being commemorated by *proper name* in the liturgical diptychs of Constantinople.

IV. Were Any Others named in the Diptychs?

Other eastern evidence concerning the offering at the eucharist of prosphoras for the living and dead, and the recording and recital of their names, I have already explained elsewhere,[25] and the western evidence was long ago reviewed by Bishop.[26] Nothing permits us to connect such practices with the names proclaimed in the liturgical diptychs of the Byzantine eucharist. Recall that diptychs were not the only occasion for liturgical commemorations. There were also the pristine prayers of the faithful following the lections, the anaphoral intercessions that appear from at least the fourth century,[27] and the other commemorations already discussed in chapter I, section A. So one cannot automatically equivalate the recital of names with the Byzantine diptychs, nor can one exploit non-Byzantine evidence to interpret what was happening in Constantinople and its ecclesiastical dependencies unless the coincidence of data warrants such an identification.

In the case of Jerome (†419), who says the names of the offerers were read out at the liturgy,[28] it is clear that he is not talking about diptychs of the Byzantine variety. The deacon is announcing not the names for whom the offerings were given and who were to be prayed for, but rather the names of the offerers and what they donated – an entirely different liturgical practice, unlike anything in early Byzantine usage.

So when Bishop says that the Byzantine sources give "not so much as a glimpse of such diptychs as those described by Atticus of Constantinople in which all classes are represented,"[29] he is misreading Atticus. In fact, we have no evidence, not even from Atticus, that such lists of names of individuals in all categories were in use anywhere in Byzantine liturgy, so

[25] TAFT, *Great Entrance* 16-34.

[26] "Appendix," 98-100, 109, 112-4.

[27] *The Euchology of Sarapion* XIII, 18, FUNK II, 176-7 = PE 132; CYRIL, *Cat.* 5, 8-9, SC 126:156-58. On this see chapter II, sections B.I.1 and II.1.

[28] *In Hezech.* VI, 18:5/9, CCL 75:238; *In Hierem.* II, 11, CCL 74:116; discussed above, chapter II, section C.II.2.

[29] BISHOP, "Appendix," 105-6. For the text of Atticus, see chapter IV at note 10.

that cannot be what Atticus is talking about. I would prefer to interpret Atticus' hierarchical list of diptychal categories – bishops, priests, deacons, laymen and women – as referring, more likely, to what we see later in the earliest extant Byzantine diptychal texts: only hierarchs, the presiding celebrant, and dignitaries were listed by name; others were commemorated via general formulas which would mention by name only those for whom a special commemoration had been requested and, perhaps, an offering made to that end. That, at least, was the system in the liturgy described by Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Hom. 15*, 43:

> 1.Then all rise, according to the signal given them by the deacon, and look at what is taking place. 2.The names of the living, and of the dead who have passed away in the faith of Christ, are then read from the tablets (penqitō) of the church, 3.and it is clear that in the few of them who are mentioned now, 4.all the living and the departed are [implicitly] mentioned.[30]

B. THE ORIGINAL PLACE AND SEQUENCE OF THE DIPTYCHS IN THE BYZANTINE LITURGY

I have already noted a surprising peculiarity of the Byzantine anaphoral intercessions: they commemorate the dead before the living. Was the same true of the diptychs? Let us look at the evidence and the theories thereon.

I. John Chrysostom

We have already examined in chapter IV Chrysostom's meagre testimony concerning the Constantinopolitan anaphoral intercessions and diptychs. Though van de Paverd admits that nothing can be gleaned from Chrysostom concerning the sequence of the intercessions and diptychs, he hypothesized, by analogy with later Constantinopolitan usage, that perhaps the diptychs of the dead came first, opened by the diaconal formula Chrysostom quotes in his Constantinopolitan sermon *In Acta apost. hom.*

[30] ST 145:528; trans. adapted from MINGANA 94.

21, 4:[31] ὁ διάκονος βοᾷ· Ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ κεκοιμημένων καὶ τῶν τὰς μνείας ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐπιτελουμένων.[32]

Winkler, dissatisfied with this solution, has argued that this formula, far from introducing the Constantinopolitan diptychs, could have constituted their finale – and thus the diptychs of the dead would have come last, after those of the living.[33] Winkler, actually more concerned with the anaphoral intercessions than with the diptychs, though the two issues are strictly related, resumes the argument of Engberding. He takes as its point of departure the fact that most anaphoras, including the CHR-related Syriac Anaphora of the Twelve Apostles[34] and other Antiochene-type anaphoras, commemorate the living before the dead. BAS/CHR, members of the same family, are a surprising exception. But since EgBAS, and hence undoubtedly UrBAS, have the intercession of the living before those of the dead,[35] Engberding argues that the same was probably true in Constantinople, and that the change came about there first in Byzantine BAS, provoked by the epicletic petition for communion with the saints, a reading already found in EgBAS, but where the dead are *not* remembered first.[36] In Constantinople this reading would have attracted to itself the commemoration of the saints and related intercessions for the departed, thus placing them before those for the living, as now:

> May your all Holy Spirit come upon us and upon these offered gifts...that all of us who share in the one bread and cup may be united with one another in the communion of the one Holy Spirit, and let none of us share in the holy body and blood of your Christ unto judgement or condemnation, but so that we may find mercy and grace together with all the saints who have pleased you throughout the ages... And remember all those who have fallen asleep in the hope of rising to life eternal...[37]

This would then have been imitated by CHR, an Antiochene anaphora

[31] PG 60:170, translated and discussed above, at the very beginning of chapter IV.

[32] VAN DE PAVERD, *Meßliturgie* 521-4.

[33] WINKLER, "Randbemerkungen."

[34] See H. ENGBERDING, "Die syrische Anaphora der zwölf Apostel und ihre Paralleltexte," OC 34 (1937) 228-37. On this text and its relation to CHR, see also TAFT, "Authenticity."

[35] DORESSE-LANNE 22-31.

[36] *Ibid.* 20-2.

[37] See H. ENGBERDING, "Das anaphorische Fürbittgebet der byzantinischen Chrysostomusliturgie," OC 45 (1961) 26-9.

probably brought to Constantinople by Chrysostom, who was ordained bishop of the capital on February 26, 388.[38]

All this is perfectly plausible, but must remain in the realm of hypothesis. For it is equally possible that the early Constantinopolitan anaphoral intercessions were undifferentiated, like the early Antiochene intercessions in *ApConst* VIII, 12:40-49, which mingle the living and the dead indiscriminately: the Church and the episcopate, the celebrant and clergy, the ruler and the army and for peace (40-42); the saints and other dead (43); the people present at the liturgy; the virgins, widows, etc.; the city and its inhabitants, the sick, the enslaved, the exiled, the banished, travellers, persecuters; the catechumens, energoumenoi, penitents; good weather and harvests; and those absent for a good reason (44-49).[39]

As we saw in chapter III, the Armenian, Coptic, and Ethiopic traditions still maintain such undifferentiated anaphoral intercessions. Furthermore, the Armenian tradition, which has the diptychs in reverse order (dead, living) from the anaphoral intercessions they accompany,[40] shows that one cannot necessarily argue from the order of the intercessions to that of the diptychs, though the same sequence is what one would indeed expect.

As for Winkler's proposal that the diaconal exclamation Chrysostom quotes was the conclusion, not the opening of the diptychs,[41] that is of course possible, but its position in the text of Chrysostom's homily would fit at least equally well as incipit of the diptychs of the departed: it is, after all, what Chrysostom uses to *begin* his discussion of the intercessions for the dead.[42] At any rate, nothing certain can be ascertained about the sequence of the anaphoral intercessions/diptychs in Constantinople before Maximus Confessor.

II. Maximus Confessor

Commenting in his *Scholia on Ps.-Dionysius' Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* III, 2, on the diptychs of the dead, which follow the kiss of peace in the

[38] See TAFT, "Authenticity," esp. 33-6.

[39] SC 336:200-5.

[40] See chapter III, section B.I and III.

[41] WINKLER, "Randbemerkungen," 57-61.

[42] Cf. above, the opening section of chapter IV, no. 1 in the text of the homily given there.

liturgy Ps.-Dionysius is describing and are the only diptychs Ps.-Dionysius speaks of, St. Maximus Confessor († 662) makes this cryptic remark:

> *The sacred tables* (πτύχα): The first diptychs are not here in our [Byzantine] usage. But in the time of this Father [Ps.-Dionysius], the diptychs were read after the kiss of peace, as also in the East.[43]

Von Balthasar has shown that Maximus incorporated into his anthology *Scholia* borrowed from John Scholasticus, bishop of Scythopolis in Palestine (536-550), among them, according to von Balthasar, the present text.[44] But the liturgical order described here, with the diptychs of the living and of the dead in two separate lists, each proclaimed at a different point in the anaphora, the diptychs of the dead preceding those of the living, is not only characteristic of the Byzantine liturgy. It directly contradicts what we know of the order in JAS, the Palestinian liturgy that would have been familiar to John Scholasticus.[45] Indeed, the commemoration of the living, then the dead, is the general rule except in the Armenian, Coptic, and Ethiopic eucharists, which, as I already noted, have undifferentiated diptychs, with the commemorations of the living and dead intermingled indiscriminately. So I do not know who could have written this text if not Maximus or some other Greek author describing the liturgical ordo of the Great Church – but certainly not a Palestinian describing the hagiopolite usage of JAS.

The "East" to which Maximus alludes is probably the Diocese of Oriens where, at least in some local usages such as those witnessed to in Cilicia by Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Hom. 15*, 43,[46] and by Ps.-Dionysius from roughly the same region,[47] as well as from further east by Narsai, *Homily 17*,[48] and the later Nestorian sources, the diptychs were indeed at this point of the mass.

Since Ps.-Dionysius mentions only the diptychs of the dead, a fact Maximus notes as peculiar,[49] and since it is *these* diptychs that Maximus calls "the first diptychs" in Constantinopolitan usage, one may deduce

[43] PG 4:136D.

[44] Von Balthasar, "Dionysius-Scholien," 164. Cf. chapter I, note 33.

[45] Text of JAS, PO 26.2:00; Jerusalem diptychs, LEW 501-3, cited in chapter III, section A.I.

[46] ST 145:527-28, cited above at note 30.

[47] Chapter II, section C.V.2

[48] Connolly, *Narsai* 10; cited chapter II, section C.VII.1.

[49] Maximus, *Scholia in Ps.-Dionysius EH* III, 3:9, PG 4:145A: σημείωσαι ὅτι τὰ δίπτυχα τῶν ἀποθανόντων ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ [=Ps.-Dionysius] μόνον ἀνεγινώσκετο.

that by his time, at least, in the rite of the Great Church the diptychs of the dead, like the anaphoral intercessions, *preceded those of the living.*[50]

The *Scholia* reveal three differences between Ps.-Dionysius' diptychs of the dead and the Byzantine usage Maximus was familiar with:

1. The diptychs of the dead were not the only ones in the Byzantine rite known to Maximus, but only "the first" of two sets. Hence the Byzantines also had a second list, of the living.
2. The Byzantines read the diptychs of the dead first, before those of the living.
3. Since the "first" Byzantine diptychs, of the dead, were not read before the anaphora, just after the kiss of peace, as in Ps.-Dionysius and "the East," then neither, obviously, were the "second" diptychs, of the living, which followed them, *pace* Brightman.[51]

Points 1-2 we have already seen confirmed by other sources. I shall say more about point 1 in a moment. As for point 3, it is confirmed not only by all euchology mss but also by direct testimony in Maximus' *Mystagogy*, which describes the preanaphoral rites of the early seventh-century Constantinopolitan eucharist on four separate occasions, yet never once mentions the presence of diptychs in that part of the service.[52]

The definitive text, however, is one already cited and analyzed above in chapter IV, section A.II.3, Maximus' testimony at his May 655 trial as reported in *Relatio motionis*, Acta I, 5. There Maximus states unambiguously that the diptychs were proclaimed during the anaphora (**1**), *first* for the dead (**5**), *then for the living* (**2-6**):

> **1.**During the holy anaphora at the holy altar **2.**the emperor is commemorated **3.**with the laity, **4.**after the bishops and deacons and the whole priestly order, **5.**when the deacon says: "And for all the laity who have fallen asleep in faith, Constantine, Constantius, and the rest." **6.**And in like manner he also commemorates the living emperors, after all the sacred ministers.[53]

The placement of the Byzantine diptychs during the anaphora is confirmed further on, when Maximus condemns the naming of anathema-

[50] See VAN DE PAVERD, *Meßliturgie* 510-12, 522. Against van de Paverd's interpretation, see WINKLER, "Randbemerkungen;" cf. also VAN DE PAVERD, "Intercessions."

[51] See section III below.

[52] *Myst.* 16-18, 23-24, PG 91:693-6, 700-4, 708-9.

[53] PG 90:117D; original Greek cited in chapter IV, note 32.

tized Monothelites in the diptychs of the departed *during the holy anaphora*: "ἀναφερομένων τῶν ἀναθεματισθέντων ἐπὶ τῆς ἁγίας ἀναφορᾶς."[54]

III. The Synod of Constantinople in 518

Brightman, however, maintained, against Bishop,[55] Connolly,[56] and others, his original view that the diptychs in Constantinople were, in fact, once before the anaphora as in the liturgies described by Ps.-Dionysius and Theodore of Mopsuestia.[57] The problem arises from the description of the proclamation of Chalcedon in the diptychs at the Synod of Constantinople in 518. Though I have already cited and discussed this text in chapter IV, section A.II.2, apropos of the history of the Constantinopolitan diptychs, we must return to it here in this context, since it has been used as an argument regarding the placement of the diptychs in the eucharist of the Great Church.

In our earlier discussion of the passage in question we saw how the people congregated in Hagia Sophia for the liturgy forced their new patriarch, "the most holy and blessed archbishop...John" II Cappadox (518-520) to enroll his deceased Chalcedonian predecessors Euphemius (490-496) and Macedonius II (496-511) in the diptychs of the dead, along with Pope Leo I (440-461) and the four ecumenical councils of Nicea I, Constantinople I, Ephesus, and especially the recent, still controverted Chalcedon (451). When this had been extorted and the eucharistic liturgy began, the unruly crowd was all ears, waiting to hear the actual proclamation of the revised lists. The Liturgy of the Word began as usual with the Trisagion, etc. (the Enarxis of three antiphons was as yet not a permanent part of the liturgy).[58] Then, after the customary lections and dismissals of the catechumens and others excluded from participation in the eucharistic half of the service,

[54] *Ibid.* Acta I, 17, PG 90:153CD; cf. VAN DE PAVERD, *Meßliturgie* 512, and above, chapter IV, section A.II.3 at note 33.

[55] "Appendix," 109-11; "Comments" IV, 384-90.

[56] R.H. CONNOLLY, Letter to Edmund Bishop in JTS 12 (1911) 400-1.

[57] LEW 528:27-529:4; 530-1 note 2; 532-3 note 11; 535:34-536:7; 538 note 13; and "Chronicle," JTS 12 (1911) 321.

[58] On the opening of the Constantinopolitan Liturgy of the Word in those days, see MATEOS, *Célébration* 1-130; BEW 167-77.

1.when the doors had been shut and the holy creed recited according to custom, **2.**at the time of diptychs the whole crowd, in great silence, crowded around the sanctuary to hear. **3.**And as soon as there were pronounced by the deacon the names of the above-mentioned four holy synods, and of the archbishops of holy memory Euphemius and Macedonius and Leo, everyone cried out with a mighty voice, "Glory to you, O Lord!" **4.**And after that, in union with God, the Divine Liturgy was finished in all due order.[59]

It has been argued that this text appears to place the proclamation of the diptychs within the preanaphoral rites, just after the creed (**2**).[60] But the text is not giving a full description of the entire mass. The only elements actually mentioned are the opening Trisagion chant, the gospel, the closing of the doors of the church (**1**)[61] after the dismissal of those excluded from the eucharist, the creed (**1**), the diptychs (**2**), and the completion of the liturgy (**4**), in that order. So the diptychs could have come at any point after the creed. I would prefer, therefore, to conclude with Bishop that since the diptychs of Constantinople were in the anaphora in 401 when Chrysostom was having his troubles, as we saw above in section B.I, and were in the anaphora ca. 630-650 in the evidence adduced in section B.II from Maximus, they were doubtless in the same place in 518 – especially in the light of the next document, which concerns, precisely, the time and event with which the synod of 518 was concerned.

IV. The Letter to Pope Hormisdas

In a letter of September 7, 518, to Pope Hormisdas (514-523), preserved only in Latin in the *Collectio Avellana* 146,[62] the same Patriarch John II Cappadox (518-520) refers thus to the restoration of Pope Leo I's name to the diptychs of Constantinople:

146.4. Tantum ad satisfaciendum scripsimus, ut et uenerabile nomen sanctae recordationis Leonis quondam facti urbis Romae archiepiscopi in sacris dipty-

[59] ACO III, 76.

[60] LEW 528.28-9 and 532 note 11.

[61] See TAFT, *Great Entrance* 408. The later diaconal admonition, "The doors! The doors!", is a warning to guard the doors *of the church*, which had been closed earlier, not the doors or curtain *of the iconostasis*, as it is often understood today (*ibid.* 405-16).

[62] O. GUENTHER (ed.), *Epistulae imperatorum pontificum aliorum inde ab a. CCLXVII usque ad a. DLIII datae Avellana quae dicitur collectio* (CSEL 35.1-2, Prague/Vienna/Leipzig 1895) 591-2; cf. *Collectio Avellana* 145:3, *ibid.* 390.

> chis tempore consecrationis propter concordiam affigeretur, et uestrum benedictum nomen similiter in diptychis praedicetur.[63]

Much of the original Greek behind this is easily recoverable via the Acts of the synod of 518.[64] The crucial phrase, "*tempore consecrationis*," is more problematic: in this period no Greek would have used such a term for what the Latins call the consecration. Bishop has successfully argued the reliablility of the Latin versions in the *Collectio Avellana* (*ante* 553), and of this document in particular.[65] But that does not solve the problem. It only narrows it, excluding that a good latinist of the time would have used the phrase "*tempore consecrationis*" to translate a general expression like "during the liturgy." Hence it is far more likely that the original for "*consecratio*" was a general Greek equivalent like ἀναφορά.

As Bishop notes, the text was an official, curial version of

> a highly important document, as the first letter that had been addressed (as far as is actually known, and may be conjectured) by a patriarch of Constantinople to a pope of Rome for more than five and twenty years. Moreover the item concerning the diptychs was perhaps the most important item in the letter, for this act was (so far as the public was concerned) the outward sign and seal of a redintegration of amity, and a herald of the close of the schism which had for so long separated Rome and Constantinople, the first practical step indeed towards peace.[66]

This would lead one to presume some care in the official Latin version of this important Greek letter, especially in a period when embassies between Rome and Constantinople on church business were frequent,[67] and Rome was hardly unaware of when the diptychs were read in the rite of the Great Church. So I think the expression "*tempore consecrationis*" confirms the view already argued: the diptychs of the rite of the Great Church had retained their traditional place in the anaphora throughout this period, including the Synod of 518.

[63] *Ep. 146*, 4, CSEL 35.2:592 = Reg 210. Cf. Bishop, "Appendix," 111; id., "Comments" IV, 384, 388, 401-4.

[64] ACO III, 76: ἐκέλευσε ταγῆναι...καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν τελευτησάντων ἐν ὁσίᾳ τῇ μνήμῃ γενομένων...καὶ Λέοντος τοῦ γενομένου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ῥώμης.

[65] "Comments" IV, 401-4.

[66] *Ibid.* 403.

[67] *Loc. cit.*

V. The Letter of James of Edessa

A letter of James of Edessa (640-708) is also adduced by Bishop as evidence for the diptychs of Constantinople.[68] Referring to the anaphoral intercessions in general, James says they are in the same place, after the consecration, in the liturgy of Constantinople and in the Jacobite anaphora, SyrJAS.[69]

> And it is right that I speak to you of the varieties that are in the kurōbho [anaphora[70]].
>
> There are two orders which are found in this ministry of the kurōbho – one affecting the kurōbho and the celebration of the mysteries themselves, and the other affecting the commemorations. And those who dwell in the imperial city [of Constantinople] and in the provinces of the Greeks – in like manner as we offer, they also make the commemorations: some commemorate many and others few and those specified. And therefore the priest says *Remember, O Lord, those whom we have mentioned and those whom we have not mentioned.*[71] But the beginning of the order of the commemorations is when we say *Moreover we offer unto Thee this same fearful and unbloody sacrifice for Sion the mother of all churches,*[72] which is the church of Jerusalem... But the Alexandrine fathers offer after another sort in that they first perform that order of the commemorations, that is, the memorials, and then after this the order of the holy kurōbho. There is also a difference in the commemorations: to wit, *As it was and is and awaiteth for the generations of the generations and world without end. Amen*:[73] in Alexandria the priest finishes the prayer *As it was* and the rest, and the people thereafter say *Amen* simply.[74]

Since these intercessions include also the diptychs in both services, this testimony, though apparently more concerned with the peculiar place of the Alexandrian anaphoral intercessions before the eucharistic conse-

[68] *Ibid.* 84-5.

[69] *Bibliotheca orientalis* I, 479-86. I cite the translation in LEW 492-93. I.E. RAHMANI, *I fasti della Chiesa patriarcale antiochena* (Rome 1920) XX-XXV, edits the same text from a Syriac ms, dated A.D. 1224, in the collection of the Syrian Catholic Patriarchal Seminary, Sharfeh (Lebanon), collated with the Vatican codex *Borgia Syr. 159.*

[70] Qurōbō, "offering, oblation," is one of the common Syriac terms for anaphora: R. PAYNE-SMITH, *Thesaurus Syriacus* (Oxford 1901) II, 3725.

[71] From the anaphora of SyrJAS. O. HEIMING (ed.), *Anaphora Sancti Iacobi fratris Domini* (AS II.1, Rome 1953) 158.5-6 = LEW 95; PE 275. See E. BISHOP, "Comments" IV, 384-5.

[72] SyrJAS, AS II.1:152.8ff = LEW 89-90; PE 272.

[73] SyrJAS, AS II, 1:170.3 (incipit only) = LEW 96; PE 275.

[74] LEW 180; PE 115, cf. 132, 139.

cration, not after it as in the Antiochene-type anaphoras, at least does not contradict what we have argued thus far, even if James does not explicitly cite the diptychs, which accompanied but were distinct from the anaphoral intercessions.

CONCLUSION

The three disputed questions in the title of this chapter have, I think, been answered satisfactorily by the sources adduced:

First, who was commemorated by name in the Byzantine diptychs of the living?

1. The pentarchial patriarchs.
2. The governing hierarchical authority of the local Church communion (patriarch, major archbishop, ruling synod).
3. The local ordinary (bishop, exarch, sometimes a hegumen-exarch, the protos on Mt. Athos).
4. Any other visiting hierarchs actually present at the service.
5. The presiding celebrant.
6. The ruling emperor.
7. His consort.
8. His co-rulers and, sometimes, other members of the imperial household.

In the diptychs of the dead?

1. The official list of deceased local diocesan bishops in good standing, i.e. not excluded from the lists for some crime.
2. *Perhaps* also the patriarchs of the patriarchate, at least the most recently deceased.
3. *On some occasions, though seemingly not as a matter of routine,* at least some of the deceased incumbants of the other pentarchial sees.
4. A selection of the earliest, most noteworthy emperors, then the latest deceased rulers with their consorts.

Everyone else, including the fathers of the ecumenical councils, were included as a category, but not actually named in the lists.

Second, at what part of the liturgy were the diptychs proclaimed? That is beyond cavil: all Byzantine evidence points to the fact that they were concomitant with the anaphoral intercessions, and not part of the preanaphora as in some other eastern traditions.

Third, in what sequence were the diptychs proclaimed? For the earlier period, this question cannot be answered with certainty, but it is probable that the remembrance of the living once preceded that of the dead, and that this more traditional order was later reversed for the reasons adduced by Engberding and Winkler. If so, this change had occurred by the beginning of the seventh century, for from that time on all sources consistently witness to the present sequence, with the intercessions/diptychs of the dead preceding those of the living.

CONCLUSION

A TAXONOMY OF DIPTYCHS

There is no need to repeat here the results already outlined in the conclusion to each chapter. Peter Finn in a recent book review said that Amish life "offered the promise of order, simplicity, and meaning." [1] That is a good description of what any scholarly explanation should offer. The writing of history is designed to order and structure, and weave a coherent story out of, what may appear – and indeed be – chaos and disorder. The aim is to write a story that can be understood. That is what I have tried to provide in these pages, especially in the concluding summaries of each chapter. Byzantine liturgy, though hardly simple, is indeed characterized by order – τάξις – and meaning, and I hope that is now apparent to the reader. The order of the Byzantine diptychs is manifest not only in their clear division into two distinct and unmixed categories, τὰ δίπτυχα τῶν κεκοιμημένων, τὰ δίπτυχα τῶν ζώντων, the dead and the living, but also in their clearly delineated parallel τάξις of presider's ekphonesis plus diaconal proclamation, each with its set incipit, finale, and respective people's response.

Placement

But not all Churches used diptychs in the same way as the Byzantine. First, there was the question of placement. Some traditions, like the always more conservative West, adhering to what seems to have been pristine practice, placed the lists in the preanaphora. Most eastern rites, including the Byzantine, read the diptychs during the anaphoral intercessions.

[1] Review of Sue BENDER, *Plain and Simple* (*New York Times Book Review*, December 31, 1989) 13.

Types of Diptychs

But diptychs show far more variety than their different placement alone would indicate. In some traditions, the diptychs seem to have been no more than a list of offerers and their intentions, the reading of which suitably followed the preanaphoral presentation and deposition of the gifts. In other traditions, the diptychs were an honor roll of the local Church's heroes, as in the Mesopotamian *Book of Life*. Sometimes the lists named only local dignitaries, as in the diptychs of Mopsuestia, or perhaps, like the Byzantine diptychs, also included the major hierarchs with whom the local Church held communion. In both these cases, however, there was also a general remembrance of categories of persons not commemorated by name. In still other traditions, like the West-Syrian or Armenian, the diptychs would evolve into a diaconal exclamation paraphrasing the anaphoral intercessions being recited by the priest, with commemorations of saints, hierarchs, rulers, people, and other intentions of the particular Church and nation.

In formulating a taxonomy of these various types of diptychs, one can make an initial categorization based on the judgement of the two British liturgical scholars already cited often in the above pages, the Anglican Benedictine Dom Gregory Dix and the Catholic layman Edmund Bishop. Dix distinguishes, perhaps too finely, two separate liturgical namings:

1. *Western nomina*: "simply lists of 'names' read out at the eucharist, whether of the communicants or (alternatively) of the dead..."
2. *Eastern diptychs*: "that *combination* of lists of the eminent living and dead, officially drawn up and regulated from time to time by the higher ecclesiastical authorities, which is what 'the diptychs' were understood to mean by the church of Constantinople when it first instituted them..."[2]

The first consists simply in "the reading out of names of strictly local interest," whether of the living or dead: the western *nomina* "are in fact the 'parochial intercessions'."[3] The second,

> the Eastern 'Diptychs'...were two conjoined tablets, the one containing the names of living persons to be prayed for, the other containing a list of saints commemorated and of the dead persons recommended officially to

[2] *Shape* 506.
[3] *Ibid.* 502.

> the prayers of the church. It is first and foremost this *combination* of lists of the living and dead which distinguishes the 'diptychs' proper from the various customs of 'naming'...[4]

The West had [1] but never [2], one of "the new Eastern fashions" in Dix's words.[5] Though Dix's observations are, as usual, acute, I would prefer to consider the two different practices he is correctly describing not as essentially distinct liturgical genre, but as different local usages within the same genre of diptychs. Edmund Bishop had also noted this basic East-West difference: that the West had never developed beyond "parochial diptychs" to the more "official" eastern type of diptychs, but he does not go so far as to consider them separate species.[6]

On this basis, already abundantly confirmed by what we have seen above, diptychs can be divided into two broad types, "parochial" and "official." But that is not the end of it For we have also seen considerable evolution in the eastern "official" type diptychs. So I would divide the "official" category into four sub-types, listed here in the order in which they appear to have evolved chronologically:

1. Hierarchical diptychs.
2. Communion diptychs.
3. Confessional diptychs.
4. Mixed diptychs – i.e., various combinations of 1-3.

1. *Hierarchichal Diptychs*

Hierarchical diptychs of the sort seen in Mopsuestia consisted in the officially approved list of bishops of the local diocese recognized as orthodox and legitimate successors of the apostles. Such diptychs were a major ecclesiological issue, and who was or was not to be named in them was kept under strict canonical control. But apart from the single exception noted below in number 3, the local Church of Mopsuestia in this period evinced no concern to express in its diptychs bonds of ecclesial communion outside its own ambience. Its diptychs of the dead were purely local hierarchical commemorations. *They had nothing to do with communion with anyone else.*

[4] *Loc. cit.*
[5] *Shape* 506.
[6] BISHOP, "Appendix," 112-4.

2. *Communion Diptychs*

Not so the communion diptychs of the sort seen in Byzantium. They are hierarchical diptychs which have expanded their horizon beyond the confines of the local Church or diocese to express bonds of communion between that Church and other Churches of the same Orthodox teaching. This communion functioned not only *within* a single administrative church conscription or patriarchate, as we see in the Egyptian diptychs, but also *between* Churches, as in the diptychs of Constantinople.

Such a development was a normal liturgical expression of evolution in church structures. After the Peace of Constantine in 312, church organization gradually solidified, and intermediate structures binding the local Churches into larger administrative units – metropolitan provinces, patriarchates – emerge. Furthermore, schisms and doctrinal crises make tests of jursidictional loyalty and confessional orthodoxy imperative. The greater formalizing and "officialization" of the diptychs from the second half of the fourth century, and their extension beyond the limits of the local eparchy or diocese, is undoubtedly attributable to such factors.

3. *Confessional Diptychs*

By confessional diptychs I mean those that concern the relations within an entire ecclesiastical conscription or national Church – one of the Monophysite patriarchates, for example – with no regard, however, to express, after the manner of communion diptychs, the communion of this local Church with any other church body. In confessional diptychs such broader concerns are expressed, rather, by *symbols of confessional adherence,* such as the names of saints and/or councils, even of another local church conscription, who are seen as representative of confessional teaching and loyalty. Severus of Antioch for the Monophysites is the obvious paradigm.

Our first inkling of this innovation appears in 550 in the Synod of Mopsuestia. It is obvious that the Mopsuestian diptychs were meant to include the names of all the deceased bishops of the see of Mopsuestia – and of that see only. The presence of Cyril of Alexandria's name in the list was an anomoly, but a noteworthy one, because it betrays the shift, clearly observable in the later diptychs of the non-Chalcedonian Churches, from purely *local diptychs,* listing only the bishops of the

local eparchy, to *confessional diptychs*, local lists that begin to be filled out with names of some foreign heroes of the confessional communion or federation of Churches we know as Oriental Orthodox, comprising the Armenian, Syro-Jacobite, Coptic, and Ethiopian Orthodox Churches.

4. *Mixed Diptychs*

Eventually, in later sources, not only dead bishops but even saints are added to the lists, and various combinations of these three types of diptychs appear in the liturgical traditions of the Eastern Churches. As Fiey has shown, these listings varied according to local needs, with preference given to locally venerated saints, and the bishops and metropolitans of the diocese and province.[7]

Of course by this fourth category of "mixed" diptychs I mean the later texts that seem neither fish nor flesh, and do not fit easily into one of the other three categories. Almost all extant diptychs are in a sense "mixed," in that a diptych manifesting mainly the primary characteristics of one of the above three categories will also contain one or more elements characteristic of another category. We are dealing here with liturgical life, not mathematics, and such distinctions of categories cannot be absolute, hermetically sealed compartments. For instance the councils were interpolated into the Byzantine diptychs in an obviously anti-Monophysite *confessional* manoeuvre, though the Byzantine lists remain a classic instance of diptychs of the *communion* type.

Structural Characteristics

Structural analysis of the diptychal liturgical unit makes it possible to identify by tradition of origin these different diptychal types.

1. *Antioch*

The diptychs of Antiochene-type liturgies, including Byzantine BAS/CHR, were *discrete*, comprising two separate lists, one for the living, one for the dead. We saw this in the writings of Theodore of Mop-

[7] Fiey, "Diptyques," 372, 385-406.

suestia, the acts of the 550 Synod of Mopsuestia, and the Byzantine sources. Except for the later interpolation of Mary Theotokos after the Council of Ephesus in 431, these diptychs listed only lesser mortals and did not include the names of saints.

2. *Jerusalem*

But the hagiopolite diptychs of JAS and those derived from this tradition – the Armenian diptychs, the Mesopotamian *Book of Life* – comprised a single, *undifferentiated* list, including the saints and the living and dead dignitaries of the Church.

We saw, however, that the diptychs of both JAS and the Armenian Rite were later Byzantinized. And it seems probable that the Syro-Jacobite diptychs were also mixed, representing, however, the reverse development: originally discrete, Antiochene-type diptychs in two lists, for the living and the dead; later "Jerusalemized" via an infusion of saints.

3. *Alexandria*

The diptychs of the Egyptian sources are also one single undifferentiated list, chiefly of the dead except for the naming of the reigning pope and local bishop, but with evidence, too, of the possiblility of adding *nomina* of the western type: the names of the ordinary faithful, a phenomenon observable nowhere else in the East. This confirms two well-known characteristics of early Egyptian Christianity:

1. that the Church of Egypt was a highly unified, tightly organized patriarchate with administration centralized in the see of Alexandria;
2. that liturgy in Egypt had many elements in common with western usage.

Why Diptychs?

So far our entire discussion has been structural and historical. But the deeper, underlying question why Churches have diptychs, or for that matter any liturgy, though not treated explicitly in the above chapters, can also be divined from what we have seen. Christian liturgy is a

form of ritual activity, a set of conventions, an organized pattern of signs and gestures which members of a community use to interpret and enact for themselves, and to express and transmit to others, their relation to reality as they perceive it.[8] Religious communities use ritual to express their *Weltanschauung*, which, at least in the historical religions like Judaism and Christianity, depends not on myth but on *history*, on the group's collective remembrance of things past, of events that have been transformed in the collective memory of the community into key symbolic episodes – "foundational events" – determinative of the community's being and self-understanding. This is the basis of ritual behavior, for it is through the interpretation of its past that a community relates to the present and copes with the future. For Christians, the "foundational event" is the fact of Jesus Christ, especially the "paschal mystery" of his passage to the Father through his saving death and resurrection. That is what Christians celebrate, in one way or another, in all their rituals.

A basic aspect of reality that communities, like individuals, must relate to is "the other." Individuals have relatives, friendships, relationships, contracts, marriages – and their corresponding ruptures. Nations have borders, treaties, alliances, citizenship, naturalization – and their negation through wars, deportation, expulsion, exile. Analogously, in the ritual process Christians, like all social groups, must deal with the question of membership, inclusion or exclusion, who is or is not to be considered a part of the group to which the foundational events pertain. So Churches have rites of initiation and communion, excommunication and reconciliation, to control internal relations; councils and synods and systatic letters for interchurch relations; and lists of the living and dead to be included and feted if they be heroes, leaders, in some cases even just ordinary members, in good standing; or to be excluded and vilified if they are not. And all this is recorded in, and celebrated in the liturgical use of, menologia, synaxaria, synodika – and diptychs.

[8] For a full discussion of the nature of Christian liturgy, see TAFT, *Hours* 331-65.

Rise and Decline

If this ritual use conditioned the evolution and employment of the Byzantine diptychs, when it ceased to be an operative factor in the life of the Orthodox Church it also also conditioned their decline. Initially, diptychal lists were like early local sanctoral calendars, which commemorated only the anniversaries of martyrs buried in the local cemetery.[9] With the end of the persecutions, however, this system begins to break down early in the fourth century, as commemoration, at first only in the calendar of their own local Church, is extended to non-martyrs or confessors, principally noted bishops who had suffered for the faith,[10] then to the early ascetics who imitated martyrdom by dying to self,[11] and, still later, to the great church leaders of the epoch.[12] Eventually – and this is the point to note – the more important of these *begin to appear in the calendars of other major churches*: by the end of the fourth century, Constantinople, for example, is commemorating Athanasius of Alexandria († 373) and Cyprian of Carthage († 258), and Augustine († 430) tells us that St. Vincent of Saragossa († 304) is venerated in the whole world.[13]

We have observed analogous developments in the growth of the diptychs. In the pre-conciliar period they were probably purely local lists. But as synods and councils multiply from the fourth century on, and contacts intensify especially at the numerous fifth-sixth century synods and councils during the endless Monophysite crisis, the decisions of these councils are ratified in diptychs by the inclusion or exclusion of the bishops of

[9] On the evolution of the sanctoral, see H. DELEHAYE, *Sanctus. Essai sur le culte des saints dans l'antiquité* (SH 17, Brussels 1927); ID., *Les origines du culte des martyrs*, 2nd ed. (SH 20, Brussels 1933); M. PERHAM, *The Communion of Saints. An Examination of the Place of the Christian Dead in the Belief, Worship, and Calendars of the Church* (Alcuin Club Collections 62, London 1980).

[10] Among the first accorded this honor were Athanasius of Alexandria († 373) in the East; in the West, the popes Pontian († 235), Cornelius († 253), and Eusebius († 309); Paulinus of Trier († 358); and Dionysius of Milan († 359).

[11] First of all, Anthony of Egypt († 356) and Hilarion of Gaza († 371). Cf. JEROME, *Vita Hilarionis eremitae* 31, PL 23:45; SOZOMEN, HE III, 14:26-28, SOZOMENUS *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. J. BIDEZ (GCS 50, Berlin 1960) 122 = PG 67:1078.

[12] The first ones inscribed in the sanctoral calendar are, in the East, Gregory Thaumaturgus († ca. 270) and Basil the Great († 379); in the West, Silvester († 335) and Martin of Tours († ca. 397).

[13] *Sermo 276*, 4, PL 38:1257.

important sees who supported or opposed orthodox doctrine as the respective councils defined it. In a word, a process of *universalization* is underway: the diptychs are no longer just a local "honor roll," but express a broader inter-church communion and confessional and doctrinal concerns.

But this universalization of the Byzantine diptychs contained the seeds of their ultimate decline. Once the fallout from the religious divisions in the East had hardened, in the aftermath of Chalcedon and the failure of all valiant and innumerable attempts to compose the issue, into the ultimate separation of the Monophysites and their formation of a separate confessional bloc of Monophysite Churches with their own independent hierarchies, the question of who was or was not to be included in the lists of the dead was no longer a burning issue, nor even relevant. Though the available sources do not permit us to trace their decline, by the eleventh century the diaconal lists of the departed have disappeared from liturgical use.

As for the Byzantine diptychs of the living, though they never disappeared entirely they could not maintain the importance they once held, at least not in their earlier form, and so, inevitably, either declined or were modified to suit new needs. Already by the twelfth century the three Middle Eastern pentarchial patriarchates – Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem – mortally wounded by the Monophysite crisis, had effectively lost their peer-status and, to a certain extent, even their independence vis-à-vis Constantinople, as a result of the Arab conquest and the establishment of the Crusader Kingdoms with their Latin hierarchy. Here too the liturgy, a sure barometer of cultural change, betrays this shift in status: Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem gradually abandoned their age-old, indigenous rites, submitting to liturgical byzantinization.[14] The upshot of all this was a

[14] This liturgical byzantinization, already observable in liturgical mss of the 9th c., was fostered especially by Theodore IV Balsamon, absentee Patriarch of Antioch (*ante* 1189-*post* 1195) resident in Constantinople (see PG 137:621; 138:953). By the end of the 13th c. the process was more or less complete in Alexandria and Antioch, though JAS remained in use longer in the patriarchate of Jerusalem, and Greek mss of the non-Byzantine Melkite liturgies continue to be copied to the end of Byzantium. This is a history that remains to be written. See, however, the recent article of J. NASRALLAH, "La liturgie des Patriarcats melchites de 969 à 1300," OC 71 (1987) 156-181; and the still useful earlier studies of KOROLEVSKY, *Histoire* I, 5-9, 12-21; ID., "Le rite byzantin," 473-97; P. DE MEESTER, "Grecques (liturgies)," DACL VI.2:1605-8.

gradual melding of what remained of the Melkite patriarchates into one, single, homogenous Orthodox communion with only one effective patriarch, the other three pentarchial incumbants being reduced to absentees resident for the most part in the capital.

This of course rendered moot the issue of inter-pentarchial communion expressed via the diptychal anaphora. And the fall of Constantinople and the end of the empire had the same effect on the diptychal anaphora as an issue uniting or dividing Constantinople and Rome. After 1453 the diptychs of the living cease to be a major issue in the extant Byzantine sources, and their liturgical obsolescence or modification was the inevitable result. In some areas they were abbreviated or simply disappeared. In others they are recycled into a general petition, no longer for dignitaries, but for the more modest needs of the faithful in general.

Pastoral Considerations

Can one speak of pastoral issues with regard to a liturgical unit that has not been a viable, effective element of Byzantine liturgy for centuries? The question is at least worth posing, for the reasons for the obsolescence of the Byzantine diptychs were not really liturgical. Furthermore, from a pastoral point of view the main liturgical problem of the Byzantine eucharistic anaphora is not the obsolescence of the diptychs of the dead and the degeneration of those of the living, formerly proclaimed during the silent recitation of the anaphora. The main problem is that silent recitation itself. Any restoration of pristine usage must give precedence to the audible recitation of that central prayer of the service, and not to the restoration of the former diaconal lists, which today would serve only the self-glorification of the higher clergy, and we have already had enough of that.

Were the diptychs of the dead to be restored, or those of the living restored to more frequent use than the few special occasions where they have been retained (patriarchal liturgies, synods, the courtesies of the anaphora according visiting hierarchical dignitaries), serious account must first be taken of two factors:

1. the reason why the remnant of the diptychs of the living degenerated in the first place;
2. the direction of all sane modern liturgical evolution toward more

popular services in which the people assume once again their rightful place.

These two issues are connected. For with regard to [1], I, at least, would look positively on the medieval evolution of the Byzantine diptychs of the living away from "official, hierarchical communion diptychs," toward a more popular and certainly more ancient "parochial" style common in the West. As I have had occasion to say more than once, certain myths dominate most popular writing on eastern liturgy, much of it from the pens of westerners mesmerized by the haunting beauty of Russian ritual. One such myth is that whatever is eastern is representative of liturgical usage come down to us from the Early Church intact. Nothing is further from the truth. For at least the first six or seven Christian centuries almost every single liturgical innovation except for the December 25 feast of the Nativity came from the East. Abbot Nicholas Egender is perfectly right in saying:

> No rite of our Christian Churches has known such dynamism and so many changes as the Byzantine. The Roman Rite through all its history, even after the reform of Vatican II, has remained a rite singularly archaic in its structure and theology. The Byzantine Rite, on the contrary, has undergone multiple influences of place, persons, theological currents.[15]

But this is not meant as *criticism*. Far from it! It is proof positive of the incredible dynamism of the Byzantine Rite before political and military disasters muted creativity. For the historian, the only human cultural institutions that do not change are those that are dead, and that includes liturgy. As Anton Baumstark said,

> It seems of the nature of Liturgy to relate itself to the concrete situations of times and places...the forms of Liturgy are subject by their very nature to a process of continuous evolution...liturgical forms are so intimately bound up with the external history of the world and of the Church and with the development of religious sentiment, itself conditioned by historical happenings, that they are constantly being subjected to very great modifications.[16]

So eastern liturgy has changed, can change, does change, indeed must change – or else abandon any pretense at being alive. But how? Specifi-

[15] "Introduction" to *La prière des heures: Ὡρολόγιον* (La prière des Églises de rite byzantin 1, Chevetogne 1975) 88-9.

[16] BAUMSTARK, *Comparative Liturgy* 18 and 1 (I have taken the liberty of forming a collage of texts from two separate pages).

cally, how should the Byzantine diptychs change? Of course that is not for me to decide. But another popular myth is that the Christian East has nothing to learn from the Christian West in theology, spirituality, monasticism, or liturgy. A book could be written on that alone, but this is not the time or place. Suffice it to say that I believe we all can and must learn from one another's traditions. And that ancient and long abandoned western "parochial" diptychs or recitation of the *nomina* might not be a bad place to start. Indeed, the start was already made centuries ago within the Byzantine tradition itself, as certain monastic mss timidly transformed the old diptychs of the living into a more viable commmemoration of the members of the local community and their needs. That is the route I would follow today.

INDEX OF MANUSCRIPTS

Manuscripts are Greek unless otherwise indicated. For full information on the mss and ms collections cited, see the respective references in the body of the text, and the information and further bibliography in the previously published volume of this history: TAFT, *Great Entrance* 435-46.

(*Abbreviations*: Ambros. = Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan; Barberini, Chigi collections are in Vat.; BL = British Library; Grott. = Badia Greca di S. Nilo, Grottaferrata; P. = papyrus; Vallicelliana = Biblioteca Vallicelliana, Rome; Vat. = Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana)

Ambros. 84 (B 15 sup.) 110, 112, 141-2
Ambros. 167 (C 7 sup.) 110, 112, 140
Ambros. 276 (E 20 sup.) 102, 139-40
Ambros. 637 (P 112 sup.) 8, 102, 110
Ambros. 709 (R 24 sup.) 102, 112, 140
Ambros. 1090 (Z 257 sup.) 102, 140
Andrew Skete Codex (Athos) 4, 150
Athens Ethnike Bibl. 716 109
Athens Ethnike Bibl. 754 4
Athens Ethnike Bibl. 860 4

Barberini 336 101, 139
Berlin Or. fol. 1609a (Sahidic) 92
Berlin P. 17032 92
Berlin P. 17612 85
Berlin P. 3602 80-2
BL Add. 17195 80, **87-8**
BL Add. 18070 102
BL Add. 34060 126, 143, 150
BL Coptic 54036 92
BL Coptic Ostrakon 32799 92
BL Coptic Ostrakon 33050 92
BL Harl. 5561 102
BL Oriental mss, see *London P.*
Bonn. Univ. Bibl. Coptic So 267 92
Borgia Syr. 159 181
Boston Diptych (tablet) 79-80, **85**, 91

Cairo P. 10395A xiii, 79, 81, 92
Chigi R.IV.2 139
Coptica Lovaniensia 22-32 92
Coptica Lovaniensia 28 80, **86-7**

Der-Balizeh P. 26

Erlangen Misc. Gr. 96 101, 110

Geneva 24 102, 110
Geneva 25 102, 110
Geneva 27 102
Geneva 27A 102, 110
Grott. Gb II 102, 111
Grott. Gb IV 108, 112, 115, 118, **140-1**
Grott. GB VII xix, 102, 139-40
Grott. Gb XV 111, 115, 140
Grott. Gb XX 102
Grott. Zd II 112

Istanbul Patriarchal Library Panaghia Kamariotissa 87 (90) 102, 118

Istanbul Patriarchal Library Panaghia Kamariotissa 139 (142) 102
Istanbul Patriarchal Library Panaghia Kamariotissa 140 (143) 140
Istanbul Patriarchal Library Panaghia Kamariotissa 141 (144) 102, 118
Istanbul Patriarchal Library Panaghia Kamariotissa 142 (145) 102, 110
Istanbul Patriarchal Library Panaghia Kamariotissa 143 (146) 102, 110
Iviron 373 102

John Rylands P. 465 25-6

Kacmarcik Codex 76

Leningrad 226 102, 112, 139-40
Leningrad Coptic Ostrakon Nr. 1133, 92
London P. 155 = BL Oriental 3580A(12) 80, **90-1**
London P. 513 = BL Oriental 4718(3) 80, **89-90**
London P. 514 = BL Oriental 4718(4) 80, **88-9**
London P. 971 = BL Oriental 4917(6) 80, **91**
Louvain Fragment 28, see *Coptica Lovaniensia 28*
Luxor Diptych 80, **83-5, 91-3**, 108

Messina 160 102, 112, 115, 140
Modena 19 (a.R.7.20; III.A.5) 102, 110, 140
Moscow Synod 261 (279) 102, 110
Moscow Synod 381 (275) 8, 109, 146, **161-3**
Moscow Synod Slav. 369 (689) 153
Munich 607 102, 110

Ottoboni 344 139
Oxford Bodleian Add. E.12 102
Oxford Bodleian Auct. E.5.13 (Graec. misc. 78) xvii, 102, 110, 115, **141**
Oxford Bodleian Cromwell 11 102, 112

Palau Rib. P. Inv. 138 92
Panteleimon 770 109
Pantocrator 214N 2
Paris 328 102, 110
Paris 347 111
Paris 391 102, 110
Paris 2509 **143**, 148-9, **161-3**
Paris Armenian 229 70
Paris Coislin 214 102, 110, 140
Paris Nouv. Acq. lat. 1791 8, 101, 105
Parma 1217/2 (H.H.I.1) 102, 111, 140
Pyromalus Codex 157

Rainer P. 4.60 = P. Vienna G 26107 80, **85-6**

Sabas 48 102, 110
Sabas 153 65
Sabas 382 102, 111
Sabas 607 (372) 4
Sevastianov 474 101-2, 110, 118, 139-40
Seymour Euchology = Yale University Beinecke Library Codex 139 102, 111-2, 140
Sinai 958 141
Sinai 959 101
Sinai 961 101, 110-12, 139
Sinai 962 101, 140
Sinai 966 102, 112, 140
Sinai 968 102, 110
Sinai 973 102, 112
Sinai 1036 102, 110, 140
Sinai 1037 140
Sinai 1039 62, 64, 103
Sinai 1040, **13-4**, 17, **61-5**, 103, **142-4**, 146, 148-9, **161-3**, 169-70
Sinai 1047 140
Sinai 1049 140
Sinai 1919 112, 141
Sinai 2017 110
Sinai 2045 110
Sinai 2046 111
Sinai Georgian 89 2
Sinai Slav. 14 113
Sinai Slav. 15 113

Sinai Slav. 40 113
Stavrou 109 102, 110
Strasbourg P. 254, 25, **35-6**, 38, 84

Taphou 334 110, 112
Taphou 517 102, 110
Taphou 520 102

Vallicelliana 112 (G 70) 102, 112, 118, 140
Vat. 573 8, 146, **161-3**
Vat. 1170 110-11
Vat. 1213 140
Vat. 1228 110
Vat. 2282 2, 64
Vat. Slav. 9 109
Vat. Slav. 14 16, 113
Vat. Syriac 39, 72
Vatopedi 133 (744) 109, **147, 161-3**
Vienna Kunsthistorisches Museum P. Fragment Nr. 1. Inv. 8599b 92
Vienna P. G 26107 = P. Rainer 4.60 80, **85-6**

GENERAL INDEX

(Patriarchs are of Constantinople unless otherwise specified)

abbots (archimandrites), conceded diptychal anaphora in Russia 155-6
abbreviations xiii-xxi
Abercrombie, N. xxviii
Abraham bar Lipah 72
Abu'l-Barakat ibn Kabar 78, 84-5, 87
Acacian schism 100, 122-4
acclamations 2-5, 16, contaminate diptychs 145, 147-8, 153-7; Egyptian 88-9
Addai and Mari, anaphora of xviii, 26, 38
Agallianos, Theodore 4
akoimetoi (sleepless) monks of Constantinople 122
Alexandrian tradition, see diptychs, eastern non-Byzantine: Egyptian; EgBAS; Egypt; GREG; intercessions; MK; Sarapion; *P. Strasbourg 254*
Allen, P. 122
Altaner, B. 47
ambo, diptychs of living proclaimed from 157-8
anaphora, diptychal 8-9, 105, 136, 155, 178, see terminology; eucharistic, of Nestorius 135; recited silently 30-32; see intercessions, anaphoral
Andida 106, see *Protheoria*
Andrieu, M. 36
Antioch/Antiochia/Antiochene liturgy 27, 38, 41-7, 175, see *Apostolic Constitutions*, diptychs
Apostolic Constitutions (ApConst) xiii, 25, 27, 36, 38, **41**, 43, 45, 88, 107, 135, 175
Apostolic Tradition (ApTrad) xiii-xiv, 24-7
APSyr (Syriac Anaphora of the Twelve Apostles I) xiii, 135, 174
Arabic CHR xiii, 148-9
archieratikon 3, 109, 142, 148; editio princeps of 15, 148; of Gemistos 4-5, 118, **150**, 157-8; see pontifical, *činovnik*
archimandrites, commemorated in Russian diptychs 155-6
Armenian liturgy 66-71; Byzantine/Jerusalem influence on diptychs of, see diptychs, eastern non-Byzantine: Armenian; liturgical commentators on 69-70
Arranz, M. xiii, 114, 127, 145
Arsenij Suxanov 152-3; *Proskinitarij* of, see Ivanovskij
Arsinoe, see Fayum; Victor of 89
Athanasius, bishop of Perrhe 131
Ἄξιόν ἐστιν 118-9, see diptychs, Byzantine, of dead: Theotokos heirmos

Bacha, C. xiii, 148-9
Balai 10
Baldovin, J.F. xxxi
Barcelona Anaphora 92-3
Bartoli, Antonio 148
BAS (Byzantine Liturgy of St. Basil, in Greek unless otherwise specified) 6, 9, 11-2, 62, 68, 101, 103, 106, 108, 110-14, 135, 140, 157, 161-3, 174, 189; Slavonic 16, 154; see EgBAS, Johannisberg, UrBAS

Basarab, Constantin and Mateu, princes of Wallachia 115
Bastianini, G. xiii, 79, 81
Bates, W.H. 38
Baumstark, A. xxviii, xxx-xxxi, 35, 146, 195
Beck, H.-G. xiii, 97
Bedjan, I. xiii-xiv, 31, 53-5
Belokurov, S. 152-3
Bender, S. 185
Beylot, R. 39
bibliography xiii-xxi
Bidez, J. xiii, 7, 122-3, 167, 192
Bishop, E. xiii-xv, xxviii, 23, 30-1, 83, 96, 108, 166-7, 172, 178-81, 186-7
Bona, J. xiv, xxvii, 23
Book of Life/of the Living and Dead xiv, 41, 57, **71-6**, 103, 166, 186, 190
Bornert, R. xiv, 106
Botte, B. xiv, 24, 35, 47
Bottini, G.C. 70
Bradshaw, P.F. 35, 39
Brakmann, H. xiv, 76, 84-5, 92-3
Brătulescu, V. 116
Braun, O. 55
Breydy, M. 125
Brightman, F.E. xviii, xxv, xxvii, 15, 23, 62, 78, 96, 177-8
Brock, S. xiv, 72, 76, 80, 85, 87
Brooks, E.W. 39, 101
Bryce, W. Moir, ms collection of 83, 85
Buhofzer, M.H. 3
Bulgakov, S.V. 154
Burmester, O.H.E. 80
Byzantine diptychs, see diptychs, Byzantine
Byzantine Rite, dynamism of 195
Byzantinization of Orthodox Melkite patriarchates 193-4

Cabié, R. xiv, 23-5, 28-9
Cabrol, F. xiv, xxvii, 2-3, 23, 83
Camelot, P. Th. 33
Cameron, A. 4
Campbell, T.L. 48
Cannadine, D. 3
Capelle, B. 28, 35
Capizzi, C. 102
Carra de Vaux, B. 125
Catergian, J. xiv, 70
Cerularius, see Michael Cerularius
Chaine, M. 81
Charlemagne 29
Charon, C., see Korolevsky
Cheiko, L. 125
chorbishop (chorepiscopus) 53, 55-6
CHR (Byzantine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom) 6, 9, 11-2, 61-2, 68, 101, 103, 106, 108, 111-4, 117, 135, 139-43, 161-3, 174, 189, Arabic xiii, 148-9
Christopoulos, M. 4
Chrysostom, see John Chrysostom; Byzantine Liturgy of, see CHR
Cilicia 94, Prima 46, Secunda 46; diptychs in 47-53, 57
činovnik (Slavonic pontifical) 4-5, **16-21**, 109, **151-5**; of Cholmogory (Xolmogory) xvi, 4-5, 151, **154-5**; of Moscow (1668) xiv, 4-5, 151, **155**
Ps.-Codinus, see *De officiis*
Codrington, W.H. xv, 72-3
Collomp, P. 36
commemorations, see diptychs, names/nomina, intercessions
commentaries/commentators, liturgical: **Armenian** 69-70; **Byzantine**, see individual authors; **Coptic** 78-9; **Jacobite** 73-4; **Nestorian** 72; see also individual authors
comparative liturgy xxvii, xxix-xxxi, 23, 44, 61, 146
Constable, G. 119
Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus 3; see *De ceremoniis*
Connolly, R.H. xiv-xv, xxvii, 23, 28, 30-1, 39, 53-5, 57, 71-3, 96, 176, 178
Coptic liturgy, see diptychs eastern non-Byzantine: Egyptian, Egypt, intercessions
Coquin, R.G. 38-9
councils, see synods
Couratin, A.H. 28

Couturier, A. 19
Cozza-Luzi, G. xv, 23, 30, 113; diptych of 113
Cramer, W. 76
Crum, W.E. xv, 80, 83-5, 88-91
Cuming, G.J. xv, 6, 35-6, 76-7, 80, 83-4, 86, 88, 118, 135
Cyprian 33
Cyprus 40-1
Cyril of Alexandria 169, controversy over Chrysostom's name in diptychs 97-100; Cyril's name in diptychs of Mopsuestia 51-2, 188; anaphora of (=Coptic MK) 77, 87-8, 92, 135
Cyril (John II) of Jerusalem xix, 25, 27, **37-8**, 86, 172

Darrouzès, J. xv, xix, 106, 127, 129
Dashian, J. xiv, 70
David, bishop of Hierissos 133
Dayr as-Suryan 80, 87
Decentius of Gubbio xiv, 28-9
De ceremoniis xx, 2-4
de Khitrowo, Mme. 122
Delehaye, H. 192
de Meester, P. xv, 155, 167, 193
De officiis xx, 3-4, 134
Delbrueck, R. 1
Descoeudres, G. xv, 2, 40
de Stoop, E. 122
Devos, J. 93
Devreesse, R. xix, 7, 41, 47, 169
Diaconovich, C. 116
diakonika (diaconal exclamations) 46, 61, 70-1, 74-7
diakonikon, liturgical book of deacon 61, 142-3, 148; sacristy 39
diataxis 4, **110-13**, **146-7**; of Athanasius III 153-4; of Philotheus Kokkinos 109, 111, 147; pontifical 4, and see archieratikon, *činovnik*, ms *BL Add. 34060* in index of mss
Didachę 25, 27
Didascalia Arabica 36-7
Diekamp, F. 101
Diodore of Tarsus 47, 49
Ps.-Dionysius xv, 7, 9, **48**, 71, 86, 103, 121, 175-8
Dionysius bar Salibi 73
diptychs, consular 1; *objects d'art* 1
diptychs, liturgical

I. In General:

associated with preanaphoral offerings or anaphoral intercessions 24, 27, 36, 43, 47-8, 53-5, 59, 71, later distinct from latter 30-2, 36; first seen in Theodore of Mopsuestia 47-8; include ordinary faithful 81, 83, 186 and saints/councils 65-6, 70-2, 78ff, 103, 116, 171-2, 175, 186, 188-9; metrical 65; names/categories/ordering of commemorations/intentions in 6-7, 30-2, 48, 52, 55-6, 58-9, 62, 64-5, 69, 99-100, 165ff, 173-83, 186ff; nature, purpose of 1-7, 23, 30-32, 52, 58-9, 166, 175, **187-91**; of pentarchial sees 97-100; (original) place and sequence of 6, 24, 27-30, 42-8, 53-5, 57-9, 68, 71, **173-85**, follow order of intercessions 68, 70-1, **173-5**; origins 23-9, 36; politico-ecclesial importance of xxvii, 52, 56, 59, 97-100, 121, 123-4, 126-30, 166, **187-8**, **192-4**, less important in West 127; proclaimed aloud 100, 122-3; terms for, 1-2, 7-9, see terminology; two early traditions of 26-9, 58-9

A. Taxonomy of: 61, **185-96**

1) Types, liturgical: 6-7, 58-9, **186-9**: **a) communion** 32, 52, 55-6, 59, 97-100, 123-4, 130, 135-9, 142, 159, **186-9**, breakdown of 142, 159; **b) confessional** 52, 59, 85, 94, 103, **188-9**; c) **everyday/festive** 55-9; **d) hierarchical** ("official") 32, 52, 55-9, 97-100, 186-88; **e) local** ("parochial") 31-2, 52, 55-9, 85, 130, 142, 159, 166, **186-7**; **f) mixed** 189

2) Types, structural: 189-90: **a) undifferentiated** (Alexandrian) 79, 81, 190, (Jerusalem) 64-5, 68, 190; **b) discrete** (in two separate lists) 185-7, (Antiochene) 189-90, and see diptychs, eastern non-Byzantine

3. Summary: 58-9, 91-4, 99-100, **185-96**

II. Byzantine:

A. In general: commemorations by name/category 14-21, 59, 97-100, 111-2, 119, 165-73, 182; communion type 59, 97-100, 130, 134, 186-8, 192-4; decline of 110-19, 130, 192-4; discrete (in two separate lists) 98-100, 103, 185, 189-90; ecclesiology of 135-8; in monasteries 136, 155, 167; Melkite 19, 115-7, 147-9, contaminated by prothesis commemorations 116; (original) place and sequence of xxviii, 9, 68, 120, 165, **173-85**; pastoral issues 194-6; politico/ecclesial importance of xxvii, 97-100, 104, 121, 123-4, 134, 166, 187-8, 192-4, esp. in relations with Rome 124-30, 194; present usage 9-21; shape well-ordered 119, 135, 185; Slavonic, see *činovnik*; terms for 1-2, 6-9, 99, Slavonic 16, and see terminology; who was named in 165-73

B. Of the dead: 9-10, 19, 95-120, 170-1; Chrysostom first witness to 95-7; concluding exclamation of 12, 14, 19-20, 107-10, 112, 116-7, 119-20, 153ff, borrowed by JAS 108, preserved as remnant after diptychs in disuse 147, 149, 153-6, 158, variants 156 (Italo-Greek) 110, 112

1. Diaconal: 10, 19, 119; at pontifical liturgy 105-6, 108-10; at presbyteral liturgy 144-6; degeneration of 19, 105-6, 108-13, 193; incensation during 10, 19, 156-7; laity commemorated in 98-100, by category 119; names listed in 111-3; later said *sotto voce* 10, 19, 105-11; local peculiarities. Italo-Greek 110-15, Melkite 115-7; one extant text of 116; original place and sequence of 104-5, **173-83**; present usage 9-10, 19; rubrics for 110-13, displaced 111-2, 115-6; saints in 116, 190; select bishops named, including those of other sees 100, 169-70, 119, 182, some excluded 169-71; select councils listed 103, 119, 171-2, 178-9; select rulers named 119, 170-1, 182, some deliberately excluded 170-1; where proclaimed/by which deacon 117, 157-8

2. In historical sources: 95-105; Chrysostom 95-100, 173-5; Gennadius I 100-1; John II Cappadox 179-80; Maximus Confessor 96, **103-5**, 168, **175-8**; Synod of Constantinople (518) 102-3, 178-80

3. In liturgical sources: 105-19: *Protheoria* 105-6; Leo Tuscan 107-8; euchology and diataxis mss 108-13; Cozza-Luzi diptych 113; Italo-Greek diptych 114-5; Melkite *qundaq* 108, 115-7

4. Marian ekphonesis: 9-10, 19, **100-2**, 105-7, 109-12, 115-6, **118-20**, 136, 153-4, borrowed by JAS 64-5, origins 100-1, text and variants 10, 101-2

5. Theotokos heirmos: 101, 113, **118-9**, 153-4, history of 117-9

6. Summary: 19, 99-100, 104, **119-20**, 172-3, **182-3**

C. Of the living: 10-18, 121-59; concluding exclamation and response 12-13, **18-21, 119-20**, 144, **156-9**, found also in JAS/Armenian diptychs 68; popes named in 124-30; text of, complete 14, critical 161-3, contaminated by acclamations 145, 147-8, 153-7, editio princeps of 11, Formelgut in 162, Melkite variant 19

1. Diaconal: 11-3, 19-21, 104, 106, **140-8, 158-9**: commemorations by name/category 11-21, 62, 104, **158-9, 165-8, 171-3, 182**; breakdown in understanding of 142; confused with intercessions 140-2, 159; form of, abbreviated 13, 19, 21, full 14, 20-1; Greek mss of 13-4, 140-3, 146-47, 161-3, only rubric of in euchology mss 140; grow obsolete from 11-12th c. 140, 142, 147, 193-4, and done silently 140, 142, 159; original place and sequence 104, **173-83**; present usage 11-3, 16-8; proclaimed on Great Feasts 145, 158;

Slavonic 12, 16-8, 21; when used 13, 16, 18-9; where proclaimed, by which deacon 156-8
2. For the hierarchy: 15-21, **121-39, 158, 167-8, 182**: between patriarchates 15-6, 59, 62-4, **121-30**, 147-50, **167-8**, order of precedence 151-2, 158, popes named 124-30; in monasteries 136, 155, 167, Russian abbots named 155-6; local 132-3; under Latin domination 137-9, 167; within patriarchates 17-8, 20-1, **130-2, 167-8**, visiting patriarch named 151
3. For rulers: 15-6, 21, 62-4, **134, 158, 168, 182**
4. In historical sources: 121-34; during Acacian schism 122-4; during Monophysite controversy 121-2; Maximus Confessor 168, 175-8; relations with Rome 124-30, 194; Three Chapters 124; Council of Constantinople II 124, of Florence 126-30
5. In liturgical sources: 134-58; diakonikon mss 13-14, 142-3; diataxis mss 146-7; euchology mss 140-2; Leo Tuscan 144-6, 148, 150; Melkite *qundaq* 147-9; Paul of Aleppo 151-2; Arsenij Suxanov 152-3;
6. In pontifical liturgy: 13-7, 19-21, 106, 148-55; in medieval mss 13-4, 142-3; of Jerusalem 15-6; present usage 16-8; Slavonic 17-8
7. In presbyteral liturgy: 9-13, 143-7, 155-6; abbreviated form of among Greeks, Melkites 13; decline of 147, done silently 147; in Leo Tuscan 144-6; in Melkite *qundaq* 147-9; often omitted or reduced to concluding exclamation 13
8. Presider's ekphonesis: 11-2, 17-20, 111-2, 115-6, **118-20, 134-40**, 144, 147, 149-55, **158**; Byzantine import in JAS 64; Italo-Greek peculiarity 135, 138-9, location in anaphora 139; names commemorated 12, only immediate superior 11-2, 135-8, 149-55, 158, ecclesial significance of 11-2, 135-8, repeated 18, 20, 151, 153-5, 158, Slavonic 12; textus receptus of 11, 135, Formelgut (2 Tim 2:15) in 88, 135
9. Text of: Arabic 147-9, Greek retroversion of 149; Greek, textus receptus 12-4, 141-2, critical 161-3, modern 12-6, 148, Italo-Greek 140-1; influenced by intercessory formulas 6, 161-3 (apparatus)
10. Summary: 19-21, 104, 130, 158-9, 172-3, 182-3

III. EASTERN NON-BYZANTINE: 23-94

1. Early: 23-59; in Alexandria 125; in Antiochia **41-6**, 96, 125; in Cilicia 27, **47-53**, Mopsuestia 27, **47-52**, 186-7; in Mesopotamia 27, **53-8, 71-6**, East-Syrian 27, **56-8**, 71, West-Syrian and Tikritan 27, **53-6, 72-4**
2. East-Syrian (Nestorian, Assyro-Chaldean): xvi, 27, 43, **56-8, 71-3, 75**; include saints 65-6; in liturgical commentators 72; local honor roll 130, 166; location 71, 176; undifferentiated 65, 190; see *Book of Life*
3. Hagiopolite (Palestine, Jerusalem, JAS, Sinai): 27, **61-6**, 169-70; include saints 65-6, 169-70; mss of 61-6; undifferentiated 64-5, 190, 176, 190
4. Maronite: 24, 27, 43, **73-4**
5. Oriental Orthodox (non-Chalcedonian): 52, **61-94** *passim*; and diaconal exclamations 70-1, 74-6, 186; confessional type, 85, 94, 188-9; include saints/synods 65-6, 71-2, 78ff; placed before or during the anaphora 6, 24, 27-30, 43, 47-8, 71, 185
a. Armenian: 6, **66-71**, 74, 175, 186; confessional type 189; include saints 65-6, 70-1; history 69-71; influenced by Byzantine diptychs/JAS 67-8, 71, 190; undifferentiated 65, 68, 176, 190; see Armenian liturgical commentators
b. Egyptian (Coptic): 6, **34-7**, 71, 74, **76-94**; confessional type 94, 189; Formelgut in text of 80; include saints 65-6, 79ff, and ordinary faithful 81, 83, 93; location 78-9; undifferentiated

79, 81, 93, 176, 190; who named 81, 93-4
c. Ethiopian: 6, 78, 176; confessional type 189; include saints/councils 65-6, 78
d. Tikritan (West-Syrian Mesopotamia): 24, 27, **54-5, 72-4**; saints/councils included 72, 103
e. West-Syrian (Syro-Antiochene, Jacobite): 6, **53-6, 71-6**, 186, 189-90; and koruz'woto 74-6; confessional type 189; location 71, 75; saints/councils included 65-6; text of 74-5
6. Summary: 58-9, 91-4, 185-90

IV. WESTERN: **23-9**, 123, 128, 142, 166, **186-7**, 190, 196; differ from eastern 186-7; less important than in East 128; placement 24, 27-9, 43

Dix, G. xv, 23, 25-6, 29, 35, 38, 123, 186-7
Dmitrievskij, A.A. xv, 4, 5, 13, 61, 118, 150, 155, 157-8
Doresse, J. 6, 26, 88, 92, 100, 135, 174
Doukas, Demetrius, editio princeps of 11, 109, 141
du Cange, Ch. du Fresne 9
Dykmans, M. 1

editio princeps, see Doukas
EgBAS xv, 6, 26, 76, 88, 92, 135, 174
Egender, N. 195
Egypt, church organization in 190; liturgy in: anaphoral fragments 92-3; diptychs 6, 76-94, fragments of on papyri 79-94; intercessions/nomina 34-8, 41, 77, frequent in liturgy 80; see Cyril of Alexandria, anaphora of; EgBAS, GREG, MK, Sarapion, *P. Strasbourg 254* in ms index
emperors, commemorated in diptychs, see diptychs, liturgical; Peter the Great of Russia (1682-1725) 154
Roman/Byzantine:
Alexius I Comnenus (1081-1118) 65, 126, 171 and consort Irene Ducas 65, 170-1
Alexius II Comnenus (1180-1183) 144
Anastasius I (491-518) 102, 124
Andronicus II Palaeologus (1282-1328) 132, 146, and consort Irene 146
Arcadius (404-405) 97
Basil I (867-886) 65, 170-1
Constantine I (305-337) 65, 96, 104, 171, 177 and Helena 65, 170-1, 188
Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (913-959) 3
Constantine IX Monomachus (1042-1055) 171
Constantine X Ducas (1059-1067) 170-1
Constantius II (337-361) 96, 104, 170, 177
Eudocia Macrembolitissa (1071) 171
John II Comnenus (1118-1143) 170-1 and consort Irene of Hungary 62, 170-1
John VIII Palaeologus (1425-1448) 127, and consort Maria Comnena 143
Justin I (518-527) 102, 123
Justinian I (526-567) 30, 99, 124, Novellae of 133
Leo VI (886-912) and consort Zoe Carbounopsina 134
Manuel I Comnenus (1143-1180) 62, 107, and consort Mary of Antioch 62, 142, 144
Manuel II Palaeologus (1391-1425) and consort Irene 143
Marcian (450-457) 65, 170-1
Michael VII Ducas, "the monk" (1071-1081) 65, 170 and consort Mary the Alan 171
Michael VIII Palaeologus (1259-1282) 105
Nicephorus III Botaneiates (1078-1081) 171
Romanus IV Diogenes (1068-1071) 65, 170-1

Theodosius I, the Great (379-395) 65, 170-1
Zeno (474-491), *Henotikon* of 100, 122
Engberding, H. 36, 83, 174
Epiphanius of Salamis 40-1
episcopal liturgy, see pontifical
Ethiopian liturgy, see diptychs, eastern non-Byzantine; intercessions
εὐχαριστήριον, typifies diptychs of MK 83, 88, 91, 93
euchologies, Byzantine 9ff, 109ff, 138, 140-2, Italo-Greek 110-5, Melkite 108, 115-7, 147-8, Siculo-Calabrian 114-5; Venetian editions of 116-7; see Doukas
Euchology of Sarapion, see Sarapion
Eugenia Cantacuzena 143
euphemia, see acclamations
Eustathius of Berytus 122, 168
Euthymius I, patriarch, *Vita* 7-8, 134
Evagrius Scholasticus 7, 122-3, 167
Every, G. xv, 65, 100, 124-6

Fall of Constantinople and obsolescence of diptychs 194
Fantinus Vallaresso, Latin archbishop of Crete 137
Farnedi, G. xxvi
Fayum (Arsinoe) 80-1, 86, 89; Victor of 89
feasts, "Great" (Byzantine) 145, 158
Fedalto, G. xvi, 34, 51, 53, 55, 81, 84, 87, 89-90, 115, 128-9, 133, 144, 146, 151, 169
Fiey, J.-M. xvi, 72-3, 103, 136, 166, 189
Filioque dispute 125-6, 129
fimi 16; see φήμη
Finn, P. 185
Fischer, F. 169
Florence, Union of (1439) and diptychs 126-30
Florus of Lyons 108
Formelgut 80, 87, 108, 135
Fortescue, A. xvi, 123-4
Foskolos, M. 117
Foti, M.B. 114
Fountoulis, J.M. 122
Funk, F.X. xvi, 34-7, 172

Gabriel of Basra 57-8
Gabriel Qatraya bar Lipah 72
Gallazzi, C. xiii, 79, 81
Gallican diptychs, see diptychs, western
Gamber, K. 28, 35, 43, 92, 96
Gedeon, M. 122
Gelasian Sacramentary 30
Gemistos, Demetrius, see archieratikon
Gennadius I, patriarch 100, 120
George, Bishop of the Arab Tribes xv, 73
Ps.-George of Arbela (Erbil) 72
George II Xyphilinus, patriarch 8, 136
Gerhards, A. xvi, 6, 76, 82, 84-5, 87-8, 90, 93
Germanus II, patriarch 8, 132
Gill, J. xvi, 129-30
Goar, J. xvi, 11, 143, 157
Golubcev, A.P. xiv, xvi, 154
Goodspeed, E.J. 25
Gori, A.F. xvi, xxvii, 1, 23
Gorskij, K. 153
Gouillard, J. 16, 171
Graf, G. xvi, 78, 115, 151
Great Entrance, commemorations during 5-6
GREG (Alexandrian Greek Liturgy of St. Gregory) 6, 76, 82, 84, 89-90, 92, intercessions in 87-8, original shape of diptychs 82, see Gerhards; Coptic GREG 78-9
Gregory Palamas 131
Grisbrooke, W.J. xvi, 31-2
Grumel, V. xix, 122
Guenther, O. 179

Haacke, W. 124
Habert, I. 3
Hänggi, A. xix
Hammerschmidt, E. 76
Hanssens, J.-M. xxv, xxvii, 2
Hayek, M. 73

Hefele, C.J. 103
Heisenberg, A. 3
Hennig, J. 24
Henotikon of Zeno 100, 122
Hindo, P. xvi, 53, 55, 73, 132
Hofmann, G. xvi, 129, 137
Holl, K. 40
Holtzmann, W. xvi 8, 126
Honigmann, E. xvii, 53
Hormisdas, pope, letter to 179-80; Reunion Formula of 124
Huculak, L.D. xvii, 16, 138, 156
Hussey, J.M xvii, 126, 134, 171

Ignatius of Antioch 33
imperial ceremonial 2-5
incensation, during diptychs of dead 10
Inglisian, V. xvii, 69
Innocent I, pope xiv, 28-9, 97
Ioann (ieromonax) 2
intercessions/commemorations,
kinds: 1-7, 23-7, 172; see names
anaphoral: 6, 24-7, 30-48, 53-5, 57, 172, 181-2; and order of diptychs 68, 70; contaminated by diptychs 30-2; diptychs confused with in Italy 110-5, 140-2; for living/dead, undifferentiated or discrete 36-7, 40-1, 68, 175; Ethiopic 175; Formelgut in text of and diptychs/intercessions 6, 80, 135, 161-3, (2 Tim 2:15) 88, 135; in early Antioch/Constantinople 175; in early sources 24, 32-46, 175; in GREG/MK 86-7, 181; of saints, originating in and only later distinct from those of dead 24, 40-2; order/place of 37-8, 41-6, 54; origins 25-9; related to diptychs 36, 70-1, 74-6
Antiochene/West-Syrian: 53-6, 175, 181-2
Armenian: 68-71, 175
Byzantine: 2-7, 181-2; anaphoral 6, diptychs confused with 110-5, 140-2; and acclamations 2-5; at Great Entrance 2-5; at prothesis 2, 116; litanies 2, 5, 42-4
Coptic: 77, 81ff, 175, 181-2
Isaac, Jacques 40
Isidore of Kiev 130
Isidore of Seville 28
Italo-Greek liturgical mss, redactions, usage 110-5, see also ms index above; monasticism 114-5; diptychs, see diptychs, Byzantine
Ivanovskij, N.I. xvii, 4, 153

Jacob, A. xvii, 2, 107, 114-5, 139, 141, 144, 149, 157
Jacob of Sarug xiv, 30-1, **53-5**
Jacobite tradition, see diptychs, eastern non-Byzantine: West-Syrian
Janeras, S. 47, 93
James, Liturgy of St., see JAS; Presanctified Liturgy of 62
James of Edessa, letter of 181-2
Jammo, S.Y.H. xvii, 72
JAS (Greek Liturgy of St. James) xvii, 2, 6, 61-6, 169, 176, 190, 193; diptychs of 61-6; influence of on Armenian diptychs 67-8; see diptychs, eastern non-Byzantine: Hagiopolite; SyrJAS
Jasper, R.C.D. xvii
Jerome **38-9**, 172, 192
Jerusalem patriarchate 62; liturgy of, see Cyril of Jerusalem; diptychs eastern non-Byzantine: Hagiopolite; JAS
Johannisberg Latin version of BAS 157
John Chrysostom 9, 38, **95-100**; controversy over name in diptychs 97-100; exile and death 97; in Antioch 41-7, 49; in Constantinople 46, 57, 95-100, 173-5; liturgy of, see CHR
John of Dara 73
John II of Jerusalem 37-8, see Cyril of Jerusalem
John IX Agapetus, patriarch 8, 136
John Marquis of Bute 80
John Moschus 30-1
John of Euboia 145

John Scholasticus of Scythopolis 7, 176
Johnson, M.E. 35
Jungmann, J.A. xvii, 24, 29
Justin Martyr 25
Justinian I, emperor (526-567) 30, 99, 124, Novellae of 133

Kantorowicz, E.H. 3
Karlin-Hayter, P. xvii, 7-9, 134
Kaufhold, H. 57
Kazhdan, A. 119, 145, 157
Klauser, T. 2
Koep, L. 23, 33
Κλήτορολογιον 3
Koep, L. xvii
Korolevsky, C. xviii, 115-6, 138, 147, 193
koruz'woto (diaconal exclamations) and Oriental-Orthodox diptychs 70-1, 74-6
Krasnosel'cev, N.F. xvii-xviii
Kratchkovsky, I. 125
Kroll, G. 30, 133

Labourt, H. 73
Lamp of Darkness 78-9, 85
Lampe, G.W.H. 83
Landersdorfer, P.S. 10
Lanne, E. xv, 6, 26, 88, 92, 101, 135, 137-8, 174
Laurent, V. xviii-xix, 127-9, 136
Leclercq, H. xviii, 1, 83, 103
Leeb, H. xxxiii
Lefort, L. Th. xviii, 80, 86, 92
Legrand, E. 115-6
Leo Tuscan, Latin version of CHR xvii, 13, 16, **107-8**, 117, **144-6**, 148, 150, 157
Liberatus Diaconus 123
Liddell, H.G. and R. Scott xviii, 8
Lietzmann, H. 47, 92
litanies, see intercessions
Loparev, X.M. 122

Maas, P. 2-3, 85
MacCormack, S.G. 3
McCormick, M. xviii, 1-3, 79-80, 85
Macomber, W.F. xviii, 26, 38, 74, 76
Mai, A. xv, xxvii
Malingrey, A.-M. 44
Mango, C. 4
Mansi, J.D. xviii, 99
Manuel II, patriarch 8
Maphrian, Maphrianate of Tikrit, see Tikrit
Marin, E. 122
Mark, St., Alexandrian Greek Liturgy of, see MK
Maronite, diptychs, see diptychs, eastern non-Byzantine; rite, origins of 73-4
Martimort, A.G. 25
Marutha of Maipherqat, canons of 55-7
Mateos, J. xviii, xxv, 4, 145, 178
Mathews, T.F. 157
Maximus Confessor 7-8, 46, 96, **103-5**, 121, 168, **175-8**
Mazza, E. 35
Meigne, M. 28
Melia, E. 23, 31-2, 212
Melkite, diptychs 19, **115-7, 147-9**; see diptychs; patriarchates, Byzantinization of 193-4
Mercier, B.-Ch. xvii
Mesopotamia, diptychs in 53-8, 71-6; liturgical commentators from 71-3; method xxix-xxxi
Metzger, M. xiii, see *Apostolic Constitutions (ApConst)*
Meyendorff, J. 132, 168
Meyendorff, P. 152
Meyer, H.B. xviii, 24, 28
Michael I Cerularius, patriarch 3, 7-8, 171; schism of 126
Michael Kalophrenas 136
Michel, A. xviii, 124-6, 171
Miklosich, F. xviii
Mingana, A. xviii, 48, 173
MK (Alexandrian Greek Liturgy of St. Mark) 6, 35-6, 38, 76, 83-4, 87, 92; Byzantinized 83; diptychs of 83; intercessions of 86, 135; Coptic MK, see Cyril of Alexandria, anaphora of

Mohlberg, L.C. 28
monasteries, stauropegic, diptychs in 136, 167
Mopsuestia, diptychs of **47-52**, 170, 173; Synod of (550), see synods; see Theodore of
Moses bar Kepha xv, 73
Moudopoulos, Th. 116
Müller, J. xviii

names/nomina 6, 31ff, of offerers 24, 28-32, 36-40, 166, 172; naming in diptychs 2, 6, 8-9, 28-33, 123, 165ff, 186-7, 196; in early sources: of Antiochia 41-6, *ApConst* 41, Chrysostom 41-6, Jacob of Sarug 53-5, Theodore of Mopsuestia 41; of Cyprus 40-1; of Egypt 34-7, 81ff, 190, *Didascalia Arabica* 36-7, Sarapion 34-5, *Strasbourg Papyrus* 35-6; of Constantinople 95-100; of Palestine 37-40, Cyril 37-8, Jerome 38-9, *Test-Dom* 39-40; in later sources: which names commemorated, see diptychs; proper names, transliteration of xxxii-xxxiii
Narsai xv, 29-30, **56-7**, 71-2, 176
Nasrallah, J. 193
Negelinus, G. Ph. 1
Nerses Lambronac'i 69-70
Nestorian, commentators 72; diptychs, see diptychs, eastern non-Byzantine: East-Syrian
Nestorius, anaphora of 135
Nevostruev, K. 153
Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos 7-9, 97-9
Nicholas of Andida 106
Nikol'skij, K. 154
Nikon, Russian Patriarch, liturgical reform of 152
Niphon, bishop of Hierissos 146
Nitria, monks of, against Theophilus 97
Nocke, A.D. 35
nomenclature, see terminology
nomina, see names
Notaras the Mesazon 129
Nowikowa, I. 117
Nyssen, W. xx, xxvi

offerers/offerings and associated intentions, see names
Oikonomides, N. 3, 134
Opfermann, B. 3
Orlov, M.I. xix, 16, 108, 113, 154
Ortiz de Urbina, I., see Urbina
Overbeck, J.J. 10

Palestine, liturgical sources for intercessions/nomina 37-40; see Cyril of Jerusalem; diptychs, eastern non-Byzantine: Hagiopolite; JAS
Pahl, I. xviii-xix
Palamas, Gregory, Palamite controversy 131
Papadopoulos-Kerameus, A. 65, 101
papyri, Egyptian, diptychal fragments on 78-94
Parenti, S. 114
Pargoire, J. 122
Paris, P. xix
Parmentier, L. xiii, xvi, 7, 122-3, 167
Passarelli, G. xix, 102, 139
patriarchal liturgy, see pontifical
patriarchs 86; Adrian of Moscow (1690-1700) 154; Nikon of Moscow, liturgical reform of 152; of Tirnovo 131-2; pentarchial 167-8, named in (Byzantine) diptychs 15-6, 62-3, 167-70, their order of precedence in 151-2, 158, see diptychs, Byzantine; incumbents of the eastern pentarchial (later patriarchal) sees:
Alexandria:
Alexander (?-362) 90
Anastasius (Monophysite, 607-619) 81
Andronicus (Monophysite, 619-626) 80, 84-5
Anianos (62-85) 84, 87
Benjamin (Monophysite, 626-665) 80, 84
Celadion (153/4-167/8) 90
Chael (Michael) 88-9

Cyril (412-444) 51-2 97-100, 169, 188
Damian (Monophysite, 578-607) 81
Dioscorus (Monophysite, 444-deposed 451) 81
Eleutherius (ca. 1180) 144
Eutychius = Sa'id ibn Batriq (933-940) 125
Ioannicius (1643-1665) 151
John Niciotas (Monophysite, 505-516) 124
Peter (Monophysite, 575-578) 81
Peter Martyr (300-311) 81
Peter III Mongus (Monophysite, 477, 482-490) 122-4
Mark the Evangelist 81, 91, 93
Mark (*ante* 1195-?) 167
Menas (Minas, Mennas) I? (Coptic, 767-775) II? (Coptic, 956-974) 90
Menas (Minas, Mennas) II (Coptic, 956-974) 87
Sophronius II (?-1166) 62
Theodosius (Monophysite, 535-566) 81
Theophilus (384-412) 97
Timothy Aelurus (Monophysite, 457-477) 81
Antioch:
Alexander (ca. 414-424) 98
Athanasius IV Dabbas (1685-1694, 1720-1724) 115
Cyril II (1173?-1179?) 144
Cyril V az-Za'im (1672, 1682-1720) 115
Domnus (441/2-450) 131
Evagrius (388-392/3) 99
John (997-1022) 126
Kyriakos (Jacobite, 793-817) 86
Macarius II ibn az-Za'im (1647-1672) 115, 151
Paulinus (362-381) 99
Peter Fuller (Monophysite, 470, 475-477, 485-488) 123
Peter III (1052-1056) 8, 126
Severus (Monophysite, 512-518) 39-40, 86, confessional symbol in non-Chalcedonian diptychs 79, 85, 87, 94, 188
Simeon Ignatios (Jacobite, ca. 1648) 72
Theodore IV Balsamon (*ante* 1198-*post* 1195) 167, 193
Theodotus (424-428) 98, 169
Constantinople:
Acacius (472-479) 100, 122-4
Anatolius (449-458) 100, 122, 168
Anthony IV (1389-1390, 1391-1397) 168
Arsacius (404-405) 98-100
Athanasius I (1289-1293, 1300-1309) xx, 8, 132-3, 146
Athanasius III Pattelaras (1634, 1652) 153
Atticus (406-425) 98-99, 121, 169, 172-3
Callistus I (1350-1353, 1355-1363) 8, 131-2
Euphymius (490-496) 103, 178-9
Euthymius I (907-912) 7-8, 134
Flavian (446-449) 100
Gennadius I (458-471) 100, 120
George II Xyphilinus (1191-1198) 8, 136
Germanus II (1223-1240) 8, 132
John Chrysostom (398-404), see separate entry
John II Cappodax (518-520) 103, 178-80
John IV Kalekas (1334-1347) 131
John IX Agapetus (1111-1134) 8, 136
Joseph II (1416-1439) 127
Luke Chrysoberges (1157-1170) 62
Macedonius (496-511) 103, 178-9
Manuel II (1244-1255) 8
Martyrius (459-470) 101
Metrophanes II (1440-1443) 129, 136-7
Michael I Cerularius (1043-1058) 3, 7-8, 126, 171
Michael III (1170-1178) 144
Nectarius (381-397) 99, 103
Nicholas I Mysticus (901-907, 912-925) 125, 134
Paisius (1652-1653) 151
Paul (641-653) 104

Philotheus Kokkinos (1353-1354, 1364-1376) 109, 111, 132, 147, 150
Photius (858-867) 100
Plyeuctus (965-970) 134
Proclus (434-446) 131
Pyrrhus (638-641) 104
Sergius I (610-638) 104
Sergius II (1001-1019) 126
Theophylact (933-956) 125
Timothy I (511-518) 102, 124
Jerusalem:
Cyril (348-357, 359-360, 378-386) xix, 25, 27, **37-8**, 86, 172
John II (386-417) 37-8
Juvenal (422-458) 122
Leontius II (ca. 1174/5-1184/5) 144
Nicephorus II (1166-1171) 62
Paisius (1645-1650) 151-3
Paul of Aleppo, diary 4, **151-2**
Patarag (Armenian eucharist), diptychs in, 66-71; see diptychs, eastern non-Byzantine: Armenian
Payne-Smith, R. 181
Perham, M. 192
Pertz, G.H. 29
Peter of Antioch 8, 126
Peterson, E. 3, 83
Petrovskij, A.V. 6
Pharan (diocese of Mt. Sinai) 62; see Sinai
φήμη, see acclamations
Philotheus Kokkinos, patriarch 150; diataxis of 109, 111, 147; ecclesiology of 132
Piédagnel, A. xix
Pistoia, A. xviii
polychronia, see acclamations
pomjanik/pomenik/pomnik 16
pontifical liturgy, acclamations at 4-5; conservative character of 146; diptychs at 13-21, 106, 108-9, 148-55, and see diptychs, Byzantine, in pontifical liturgy; archieratikon; Paul of Aleppo; *Proskinitarij* of Arsenij Suxanov (see Ivanovskij); Slavonic, see *činovnik*
popes, in Byzantine diptychs 124-30
Alexander III (1159-1181) 126
Benedict II (684-685) 125
Boniface VII (974, 984-985) 125
Eugene IV (1431-1447) 127, 129
Felix III (II) (483-492) 122-3
Gregory VII (1073-1085) 171
Hormisdas (514-523) 124, 179-80
Innocent I (401-417) 28-29, 97
John X (914-928) 125
John XV (985-996) 125
John XVI (997-998) 125
John XVIII (1004-1009) 125-6
Leo I, the Great (440-461) 103, 121-2, 168-9, 178-9
Leo IX (1049-1054) 126
Urban II (1088-1099) 8, 126
Vigilius (537-555) 124
presbyteral liturgy, diptychs at 9-13, 19-21, 144-6, 155-6
Price, S. 3, 4
Proskinitarij of Arsenij Suxanov 4, **152-3**; see Ivanovskij
Protheoria 31, 105-6
prothesis commemorations 2, contaminate diptychs 116

Quasten, J. 47
Quecke, H. 76, 80, 92
qundaq (Melkite Arabic liturgikon) 108, 115-7, 147-8

Radu, B. 4, 151
Raes, A. xiii, 116
Rahmani, I.E., xx, 73, 181, see *Testamentum Domini*
Ratcliff, E.C. 25, 28
Renoux, A. (C.) 68
ritual, religious, meaning/purpose of 191
Roca-Puig, R. 93
Rodopoulos, P.E. 35
Roman diptychs, see diptychs, western
Rordorf, W. 25
Runciman, S. 126

Sader, J. 73
Sa'id ibn Batriq (Eutychius, patriarch of Alexandria) 125

Sa'id ibn Yahya 125
St. Catherine, Sinai Monastery of 142-3, 161-3; see index of mss
St. Savior Monastery, Messina 114-5, 141, Typikon of 145
saints/Mary named in diptychs, see diptychs
Sakkelion, I. xix, 8, 136
Salaville, S. 69
sanctoral calendar, like diptychs 192
SS. Salvatore di Messina, Monastery of, 114-5, 141, Typikon of 145
Samir Khalil 36, 76
Samuel, D.H. 93
Sansterre, J. 1
Sanz, P. 86
Sarapion, Euchology of 25, 27, 30, **34-5**, 38, 92, 172
Šarar (Maronite Anaphora of Peter III), diptychs in 24, 27, 43, **73-4**
Satzinger, H. 92
Sauget, J.-M. 73
Sava, protos of Mt. Athos 133
Scaduto, M. 114
Scetis (Wadi an-Natrun) 80, 87
Scheidweiler, F. xvi
Schermann, Th. 76
Schmidt, J. 2
Schneider, C. 3
Schoell, R. 30, 133
Schultze, B. 137
Schwartz, E. xiii
Scott, R., see Liddell, H.G.
Şerbănescu, N. 115
Severus of Antioch 39-40, 86; named as confessional symbol in non-Chalcedonian diptychs 79, 85, 87, 94, 188
Sherwood, P. 7
Sinai, diptychs of, see St. Catherine; Monastery of St. Catherine 61-62, mss of, see ms index
sinodik 16
Sklabenitis, T.E. 117
Slavonic diptychs 12, 16-8, 21, 153-6; see *činovnik*; diptychs; pontifical, Slavonic
Soliman, W. 36
Soueif, F. 74
Sozomen 192
Spinks, B. xiii, 25, 36
Srawley, xix, 23, 25
stauropegic monasteries, diptychs in 136
Stefan Lazarević, Despot of Serbia 143
Stegmüller, O. xix, xxvii, 1, 23, 82
Stichel, R. 156
Strasbourg papyrus 35-6
Straub, J. xiii
Stringer, M. xxx
Strittmatter, A. 8, 101, 105, 138-9
Suxanov, Starec Arsenij, *Proskinitarij* of, 4, **152-3**; see Ivanovskij
Symeon Metaphrastes 122
synodikon 16, 171
synods/councils, included in diptychs 65, 72, 78, 103, **171-2, 178-9**
  Chalcedon = IV ecumenical (451) 103, 131, 178-9
  Constantinople I = II ecumenical (381) 103, 178-9
  Constantinople (518) **102-3**, 171, **178-80**
  Constantinople II = V ecumenical (553) 49, 99, **124**
  Constantinople (1089) 126
  Ephesus = III ecumenical (431) 103, 178-9, 190
  Ephesus, "Robber Council" of (449) 122
  Elvira (305-306) 28
  Florence (1439) xiv, 126-30
  Frankfurt (794) 29
  Lateran (649) 104
  Mopsuestia (550) 30, **49-52**, 170, 188, 190
  Moscow (1667) xv, 154
  Nicea I = I ecumenical (325) 55, 57, 72, 103, 178-9
  "of the Oak" (403) 97
Syria, diptychs in 71-76, see diptychs, eastern non-Byzantine
SyrJAS (Syriac redaction of Liturgy of St. James) 135, 181
Syro-Antiochene (Jacobite) diptychs,

see diptychs, eastern non-Byzantine: West-Syrian
Syropoulos, Sylvester xix, 127-9

Taft, R. xiii, xix-xx, xxviii, xxxi, 2-4, 6, 10, 24, 26, 43, 54, 56, 73, 77, 80, 109, 114, 122, 139, 143, 145, 150-3, 157, 166, 172, 174-5, 178-9, 191
Talatinian, B. 69
Talbot, A.-M. Maffry xx, 8, 133
τάξις, order, characteristic of Byzantine rites 119, 185
terminology **xxxii-xxxiii, 1-2, 6-9, 30-2**, 36, 41, 99, 105-6, 123-4, 131, 134, 136, 143, 168, 178, 180-1; Slavonic 16, diptychs confused with acclamations 145, 153-7
Testamentum Domini (TestDom) xx, 25, 36-7, **39-40**
Theodore of Andida 106
Theodore Lector xvi, 7, 101, 124
Theodore of Mopsuestia xix, 25, 27, 29, 41, **47-8**, 71, 121, 173, 176, 178, 189-90; date and place of homilies 47
Theodoret of Cyrrhus xvi, 98-9
Theotokos heirmos, see diptychs, Byzantine, of dead
Thiel, A. 123
Three Chapters 124
Tikrit, Maphrianate of, xvi, 54-5, 72-3; diptychs of, see diptychs eastern non-Byzantine: Tikritan
Tillyard, H.J.W. 2-3
2 Tim 2:15 as Formelgut in diptychal commemoration of hierarchy 88, 135
Tisserant, E. 55, 138
Tonneau, R. xix
transliteration of proper names xxxii-xxxiii
Treitinger, O. 3
Trempelas, P.N. xx, 4, 102, 109, 111, 150-1
Treu, K. 92
Triacca, A.M. xviii
Tuilier, A. 25
Tuscan, see Leo Tuscan
typikon, of the Great Church, of St. Savior in Messina, Sabaitic, 145

UrBAS (primitive redaction of EgBAS) xx, 101, 135, 174; see Doresse
Urbina, I. Ortiz de, xx, 10, 53, 55

Vailhé, S. 122
Vallaresso, Fantinus 137
van de Paverd, F. xx, xxvii-xxviii, 8, 23, 28, 38-9, 43-5 96, 99, 101, 105, 173-4, 177-8
van Haelst, J. xx, 26, 85
Vasiliev, A. 125
Vasilij Dimitrievič, Grand Prince of Moscow 168
velikaja poxvala 16; see acclamations
Verheul, A. 35
Verpeaux, J. xx, 3, 134
Vetter, P. 69
Villecourt, L. xx, 78-79, 84
Vööbus, A. 55
Vogt, A. xx, 3
Volbach, W.F. 1
von Balthasar, H.U. xx, 7, 176
vykličkа 16, 18; see diptychs

Wagner, G. 24
Walter, Ch. 3
West, F.S. xxxi
White, G. 39
Wilson, R. McL. 76
Winkler, G. xx-xxi, xxvii, xxix, 24, 66, 68-9, 101, 105-6, 108, 110, 112, 118-9, 135, 138-40, 150, 156, 174-5, 177
Wirth, P. 83
Witzel, G. 157

Xosrov Anjewac'i 69

Yovhannes Arčišec'i 70

Zanetti, U. 117
Zayyat, H. 125
Zentgraf, K. 92
Zoe Carbounopsina, 4th wife of emperor Leo VI, dispute over commemorating 134

Finito di stampare
nel mese di novembre 1991
dalla
Scuola Tipografica S. PIO X
Via degli Etruschi, 7
00185 Roma